

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JULY 8, 1886.

The Week:

MR. BOYLE and three other Democratic members of the Pan-Electric Investigating Committee have presented a long and labored report, which seeks to "whitewash" the officials implicated in the scandal, and a resolution declaring that "a full, fair, and exhaustive investigation has failed to adduce any evidence which tends to show that Attorney-General Garland, Solicitor-General Goode, Secretary Lamar, Indian Commissioner Atkins, Railroad Commissioner Johnston, or Senator Harris—they being the officers named in the Pan-Electric publications of the newspaper press, which gave rise to this investigation—did any act, official or otherwise, connected with the matter investigated, which was dishonest, dishonorable, or censurable." Such an issue of the investigation has been expected by the public all along, and the report will change nobody's opinion. Indeed, the whole investigation has not affected the public judgment of the matter, because it has not shaken the main facts upon which that judgment was based. These facts are that Mr. Garland and his official associates went into the Pan-Electric speculation years ago under suspicious circumstances, and that Mr. Garland retained his stock after becoming Attorney-General and when the value of his investment was to be affected by the action of his department. No amount of special pleading will ever convince the public that this was a proper thing to do. At the very best it was a refusal to "avoid the appearance of evil," which is an obligation of almost as binding character as the obligation not to do evil. The whole scandal has been due to the Attorney-General's lack of delicacy of feeling. Mr. Garland has paid a heavy penalty for his blunder. When he went into the Cabinet he enjoyed universal regard, and the public looked with favor upon his well-known ambition to occupy a seat upon the Supreme Bench at no distant time. To-day he is greatly discredited, and now that the investigation of his conduct is concluded, he ought to relieve the President of the undoubted embarrassment caused by his presence in the Cabinet.

Senator Edmunds has brought in a bill for the reform of the civil service, which gives the President the appointment of all the minor officials without the advice or consent of the Senate, but makes them irremovable during their term without a trial on charges before a United States judge. One does not need to know much about the United States civil service to know what the result would be; one only needs to know a little of human nature. No man of capacity or business experience would take charge of an office containing a large number of subordinates if he could not get rid of any of them without a formal trial in a law court. Four-fifths at least of the things which make a clerk incompetent are small things, any one of

which would seem ridiculous on paper, and absurd to lay before a United States judge. It is the repetition of them which mostly decides that a man is not worth his salary. Nothing in the whole art of administration, whether civil or military, is so well settled as that there can be no proper responsibility in the chief if he have no discretion in the selection of his subordinates. Some capable men might be found ready to take charge of offices under Mr. Edmunds's bill, but if they did so, they would probably at once go to work to break it down. They would let inefficiency and disorder have full swing, and refuse to go into court with trumpup stories about A's coming late, and B's drinking, and C's being unmannerly, and D's spelling badly and blotting his books, until the public offices became public nuisances and the law was repealed.

President Cleveland's policy in regard to civil-service reform has always had two weak points. The first is his appointing to several important places—the New York Custom-house is one of them—persons who were notoriously either not in sympathy with the reform or openly hostile to it. The second is his failure thus far to punish a single official for displaying his dislike of or contempt for the rules by disregarding or evading them. The notion that such a reform as this can be carried out by agents who hate it is of course a chimera. A good illustration of all this has just been afforded by the working of the new rule adopted by the Civil-Service Commission at Washington, which provides that the examining boards at various points shall elect their chairmen and secretaries every year, these officers having hitherto been appointed by the Commission, as in fact they ought to be, for they are nothing more than the agents of the Commission. However, if the Government officers at various points were, as they ought to be, men chosen because they believed in the reform, and were ready to carry it out cheerfully, the change might not in practice do any harm. But see how it works in New York. The Chairman and Secretary of the Examining Board at the Custom-house, Messrs. Comstock and Babcock, have filled these positions for years. They thoroughly understand the new system and thoroughly believe in it, and have had more experience of its working than perhaps anybody in the country. Moreover, they are the only friends of the reform in a Board of eight members. Under the new order, which seems to have been a concoction of Mr. Oberly's, these two gentlemen have been turned out, and there have been elected in their places two open enemies of the reform, who can and doubtless will, in a thousand ways, hinder its execution, either by evading it or making it ridiculous. These suspicions may prove unfounded, but we hold that there should be nothing in the character or antecedents of the men filling high places in any of the great Government offices, to give rise to them.

The appointment of Gov. Hugh S. Thompson of South Carolina as Assistant Secretary of

the Treasury, to succeed Mr. W. E. Smith, who resigns to accept the solicitorship of a Western railway, is one of the very best which Mr. Cleveland has made since he became President. Gov. Thompson has been prominent in the affairs of his State for the past ten years, during the first six as Superintendent of Education, and during the last four as Governor. In the former capacity he built up the public-school system amid great difficulties and obstacles, earning the hearty confidence of both races by his impartial oversight; and in the higher office he has justified the faith which the colored Republicans reposed in him. Gov. Thompson is a sincere believer in civil-service reform, and it was largely his influence which led the South Carolina Legislature in 1880 to adopt a resolution urging Congress to "take such measures as may be expedient for the reformation of the civil service, so that the tenure of office under the General Government may no longer be dependent upon party success or subject to levy by means of forced pecuniary contributions to any political party, and so that capacity and character shall be the test of fitness for office and the sole but certain guarantee of its tenure"; and which led the Legislature four years later, after Mr. Cleveland's election to the Presidency, to "reiterate and reaffirm the principles and policy of the said resolution," by adopting a further resolution declaring that "this General Assembly adheres to the same and tenders to the Administration of the President elect the approval and support of the people of this State in carrying out the provisions of the law in regard to civil-service reform."

The reported consideration by the President of the expediency of abolishing the age limit of forty-five for admission to the civil service does not raise any very serious question. It may be said in general terms that those who favored the present limit did so in the expectation of drawing into the service men who meant to make it a career, or at all events stay in it a considerable period. They thought, and not unnaturally, that a man who sought for a subordinate place in the public service after forty-five, would be apt to be a man who had failed badly in something else, or whose powers of work were waning, and who would consequently probably have to leave it very soon. But we doubt very much whether the abrogation of the rule would have much practical effect. It would pacify a few elderly and discontented "workers" in various parts of the country, who think all the places are reserved for young college graduates, but it would not admit many, if any, to the service who were not capable, for a while at least, of rendering good service. If a man over forty-five can pass the examination, there seems to be no good reason why he should not go on the eligible list. If the appointing officer thinks him too old for the work, he need not take him, and if he takes him, and he becomes too old, he can be got rid of in the usual pitiless fashion.

The President's vetoes of private pension bills are calling out a mass of testimony as to the fraudulent character of many of the claims which are advanced. The editor of the Portland *Oregonian*, who served in the ranks of the Union army, declares that he knows of his own knowledge, that "since the passage of the Arrears of Pension Act about every shirk and utterly worthless veteran of his brigade has been a successful applicant for a pension." In one case a wagoner, who lost his leg by tumbling off his team while helplessly drunk, got a pension on the plea that he had lost it in action with the enemy. In another case a man swore to having received injuries in a battle at which he was not present; and described his regiment as supporting a battery, when it was in a thick wood, distant half a mile from any artillery. In several instances within the editor's knowledge, men who escaped from service by shooting off their fingers have received arrears of pensions as if for honorable wounds. He describes one case where within two years a New England merchant, worth at least \$50,000, who never was in action, and who resigned after less than three months' service, has mortified his decent comrades by trying to get a pension on the plea that he could trace his present condition of imperfect health to a catarrh he suffered from while in service. It is not a pleasant reflection, but it is unfortunately the fact, that there was a considerable percentage of shirks in the Union army, who are as conscienceless in pressing fraudulent claims now as they were in avoiding active service during the war, and it was time that the attention of the country should be sharply called to the gross abuses which have been growing up under the pension system.

President Cleveland sent a very depressing letter of regret to the Tammany braves assembled for their Fourth of July celebration. Great preparations had been made for having a true Jeffersonian reunion. None but iron-clad Democrats of the approved old-fashioned type had been selected to make addresses, and the hated Mugwump doctrine of civil-service reform was to be given such a drubbing as it had not received in many a day. Into this choice assemblage the President dropped his letter, containing the following passage:

"I should be very glad to join those who on that occasion will renew their pledges of devotion to the principles for which the fathers of the republic fought. *These principles had no relation to personal advantage or ambitious schemes, but were adopted and cherished because their enforcement promised prosperity and greatness to a free and victorious people.*"

The sentence which we have put in italics was a plain announcement that the man whose nomination Tammany had tried in vain to prevent, and whose election Tammany had tried in vain by wholesale treachery to defeat, was the same man still, and just as deserving of Tammany hatred as he had ever been. More than this, it was a fresh notification to the Wigwag, crammed with perspiring and hungry Jeffersonians, that there would be no "clean sweep." What cheer was there after that in Senator Vance's blatant denunciation of civil-service reform, and Mr. Randall's praise of the "grand old society"? Neither of those men had any offices to distribute, and both of them had been

defeated in Congress in their efforts to break down the Civil-Service Law.

All the Fourth of July oratory appears to have been pretty barren of ideas. Mr. Bowen's annual display at Woodstock was much less entertaining than usual, none of the speakers appearing to have anything to say. At a soldiers' reunion in Chicago, Senator Logan made a very melancholy pension bid for votes, at the close of which he said: "The evidence of decay is upon us to-day. If I have shown weakness in your presence to-day, I hope that in the light of our past struggles you will forgive me." The speech was the usual bloody review of the war which Logan always makes, and which he has put into type of several kinds in his great history. It is high time that signs of "decay" appeared upon it, for it has become very wearisome to the public, and we should think that the soldiers would by this time be tired of it.

It is very hard for the average Republican organ to give up the idea that there is something still to be made out of the sectional issue. Referring to the statement that the Alabama Republicans have decided not to put any ticket in the field this year, on the ground that it would be of no use, a Blaine organ in Connecticut says: "These things should not be so, and they will not continue after the Republican party is restored to power." And yet "these things" came to be "so" while the Republican party was in power. In deciding to nominate no ticket at the first State election under a Democratic President, the Alabama Republicans only follow the same course they pursued at the last State election under a Republican President in August, 1884, when they made no opposition whatever to the Democratic nominees, upon precisely the same ground as that on which they base their present policy. It was the same way in the last State elections held under a Republican President in South Carolina and Georgia. If the Republican party in the South had fallen into decay under a Democratic administration, there might be something plausible about the claim that things would be different under a Republican President; but considering that a whole line of Republican Presidents could not do anything to arrest the process of deterioration, the idea that "restoring" the Republican party to power will cure the trouble is rather too absurd for the year 1886.

None of the Republican platforms thus far adopted, in Maine, Vermont, and Pennsylvania, appear to have hit upon an issue which can serve as a rallying cry for the party. They all studiously avoid any mention whatever of the most pressing question of the day—silver coinage. Has the party no convictions upon this? They are all very bitter in their denunciation of the Morrison Tariff Bill, but as that measure has failed in a Democratic House, it is difficult to see how party capital can be made from it. The Maine platform was very ferocious on the fishery question, but that, too, has been settled, and in such a way as to do credit to the Cleveland Administration. A significant plank in the Vermont platform was a commendation to "Republicans everywhere of

the policy of dropping past dissensions, of welcoming all who will return to the party allegiance"; but this found no echo in the Pennsylvania declarations. It is likely to be looked upon coldly as an Edmunds contribution, more or less tainted with Mugwumpism; yet it is the only utterance thus far made which has in it any important bearing upon the prospects of the party in future national contests. The Republicans failed in the last campaign because they did not have a majority of the votes cast, and they will continue to fail for the same reason unless they take some steps towards securing recruits. Making faces at the Mugwumps, and nominating candidates whom they will not support, are not steps of this kind.

Next to its absurdity, the most noticeable thing about the Pennsylvania Republican platform is the feebleness of its denunciation of the Cleveland Administration. "We bring an indictment," it says, "against the present Democratic National Administration for its inconsistency, indifference, and inefficiency, which has been alike inconsistent in the methods employed to promote promised reform, indifferent to our industrial and commercial interests, and inefficient through lack of experience and ability to meet any of the grave questions of the day." Not a single specification is advanced to support the indictment—no allusion even to Higgins. There is nowhere in the platform any of that good round denunciation which ought by this time to appear in Republican platform literature if there is going to be any real "war" in this fall's campaigns. The pension vetoes, which we inferred from the comments of some of the party's organs were to be utilized as bait for the soldier vote, are not mentioned at all; and even the Pan-Electric scandal passes unnoticed.

Mr. G. F. Hoar made a terrible attack on the President on Wednesday week, apropos of secret sessions of the Senate, which he strenuously defends. His thesis is that nobody wants open executive sessions but the newspapers, and he denies that the newspapers in any sense represent public opinion; this, he says, is revealed, in the old seventeenth-century fashion, by petitions and elections. So he will not agree, we presume, to have open sessions until the people have voted for it at elections; but how it will be got before the people he does not point out. He said one of those delightfully absurd and startling things for which he is famous, when he averred that the Senate never stood higher in the estimation of the people than it does now. After all these gymnastics came the attack on the President. He denied his title to his office, which he declared properly belonged to the "idolized" Blaine, and then made the usual accusation of breaking his pledges and having used the appointing power to an unexampled degree for partisan purposes. Time must hang heavily on any one's hands who argues with Mr. Hoar, because he can, owing to his habit of inventing his premises, never be refuted. No matter what you say, he stops you with a "fact." So that all that can be done with him is to expose him occasionally and then let him run.

In his diatribe Senator Hoar referred to the removal by the Post-office Department during the first twelve months of the present Administration of 8,635 fourth-class postmasters—which, it may be remarked, is only about one in six of the whole number—and said: "The President knows that under the law the term of every postmaster in the country would expire during his Administration." The whole number of post-offices in the United States when the present Administration came in was 51,277, of which 2,346 belonged to the first, second, and third classes and were filled by Presidential appointment. The remaining 48,931 were fourth-class offices. The Revised Statutes provide (section 3830) that "Postmasters of the fourth-class shall be appointed and may be removed by the Postmaster-General." *The United States Official Postal Guide* declares (section 750) that "Postmasters at fourth-class offices are appointed by the Postmaster-General, and their term of tenure has no specified limit." In other words, Mr. Hoar stated that the term of all the 51,277 postmasters in the country would expire during Mr. Cleveland's Administration, while the fact is that the term of 48,931 of them "has no specified limit," and will not expire during the present administration or at any fixed time. This is a fair sample of the relation between fact and fiction throughout the whole of Mr. Hoar's speech.

Mr. J. W. Alsop of the Connecticut Senate, for several years Chairman of the Agricultural Committee of the Legislature, and an earnest advocate of the Connecticut law which requires imitation butter to be sold simply on its merits, declares himself and the committee of which he has been chairman decidedly opposed to prohibitive legislation or taxation of imitation butter, as unjust to the manufacturer and to the consumer, and adds that one of the strong reasons for the enactment of the present law was the practice of farmers to mix oleomargarine with their own dairy butter. The Dairy Commissioner of Connecticut, according to the *Middletown Constitution*, reports that the chief trouble "is with an article which purports to be the first quality of dairy butter, and is sold at a fancy price." He "doubts whether Connecticut dairies at this season, when grass is plenty, are doing much in the bogus line, though he has reason for suspecting that they have done their share hitherto, and will need watching next fall."

It is melancholy but true that Lord Salisbury's word on a matter of fact does not carry the same weight in politics that it once did, and that consequently his denials addressed to Mr. Parnell and Mr. Gladstone in his letter on Tuesday week do not count for much. When he was Foreign Secretary under Lord Beaconsfield in 1877, he entered into a secret agreement with Count Shuvaloff, the Russian Ambassador, and embodied it in a memorandum by which he bound England to make a number of important concessions to Russia at the Berlin Conference, which was shortly to meet. When the Conference did meet, he and his chief went through the form of resisting stout-

ly in public what they had already surrendered in private, of course for the purpose of humbugging their own people. A copying clerk in the Foreign Office got hold of the memorandum, and published it in the *Globe*, and it, of course, made a profound sensation. But Lord Salisbury, on being taxed with it in the House of Lords, flatly denied its existence. He was, of course, soon after exposed, but he bore it bravely, and now charges opponents with "baseless fabrication" as cheerily as if it had never happened. A public man, however, does not get over this sort of thing easily, as our own Blaine knows to his cost. Neither Lord Salisbury's affirmations nor his denials now settle anything finally in the public mind.

His denials now relate to an interview between Parnell and Lord Carnarvon. Parnell asserts that Carnarvon asked for it—he being at the time Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland—and talked "autonomy" with him, and gave him to understand that the Conservative party might, if properly supported, give the Irish even autonomy enough to enable them to "revivify their industry" by protective duties. The corroboration of this is that Lord Carnarvon acknowledges there was an interview, that Parnell soon after made a speech in which he did propose protective duties, and that the Irish supported the Conservatives at the elections, which they would hardly have done, angry as they were with the Liberals, had they believed that, as Lord Salisbury now says, they had nothing to expect from the Conservatives but the suppression of the National League and twenty years of "resolute government." Lord Carnarvon, on the other hand, alleges that the interview was of Parnell's seeking, which is unlikely, considering Parnell's distrustful and disdainful ways with Englishmen, and that all the talk of autonomy was on Parnell's side, which seems a little ridiculous, as there was no occasion to get Parnell into a private room in order to hear him talk autonomy. Lord Salisbury acknowledges also that Lord Carnarvon told him of the projected interview two days before it took place, and that he gave him an account of it afterwards. But these admissions have only been made under a fire of taunting questions from Mr. Gladstone, and the general impression made by the whole affair is undoubtedly unfavorable to the Tories. There are probably few people who really doubt that if Mr. Gladstone be now defeated, the Tories will themselves before long grant home rule to the Irish in somewhat the same shape, just as, after driving Earl Russell from office in 1866 for trying to extend the suffrage, they extended it themselves as soon as they got into power in 1867. By that time the English public will have got used to the idea, and the dreadful predictions which the Tory orators are now making about the excesses in which the Irish will indulge if they ever get a Parliament, will have lost their force through familiarity.

The tide continues to run against Mr. Gladstone. He is losing seats, or retaining them by diminished majorities in the boroughs. He may still be saved by the counties, but there is

no chance of his doing more than holding his own. This will be a great feat, to be sure, considering how his colleagues have deserted him, but it will be simply a personal triumph. It will not make home rule possible. On this result nobody can possibly be congratulated. It is not likely to furnish materials for either a Tory Ministry or a Unionist Ministry, or even a coalition Ministry. The Opposition united will probably at best have a bare majority, and the Irish question will stare them in the face, calling for solution as imperiously as ever. Moreover, Parnell will still have to be reckoned with, and he will certainly meet his enemies with as indomitable will and as high courage as ever. He will force them either to treat with him or to resort to desperate measures, which will make their talk of imperial unity more plainly absurd than it is now.

In commenting, at the time, on the new electoral law adopted by the Belgian Chamber last August, we expressed the opinion that it was an ingenious piece of partisanship, well calculated to make the recovery of the anti-clerical phalanx in that body from its late reverses a task of almost insurmountable difficulty. "The Liberals of Brussels," we remarked, "who suffered so unexpected a defeat in June, 1884, but counted on a *revanche* in the next elections, will find it now very difficult to reverse the last electoral verdict. Another stronghold of the Liberals, Ghent, where the anti-Clerical victory in 1884 was achieved only by a very light majority, is in danger of being lost in 1886, with the possible disastrous result of securing the Government party a two-thirds majority in the Chamber." The elections of last month have completely justified these predictions. The Liberals were beaten in Brussels, Charleroi, Verriers, and other towns, which were formerly chief seats of their strength, and were totally routed in Ghent, in consequence of which their minority in the Chamber has been reduced from fifty-two members to forty, and the clerical majority has risen from eighty-six to ninety-eight, or more than two-thirds of the whole number. The late socialistic disorders in the mining districts of the kingdom, which frightened the mass of the manufacturers into supporting the powers that be, while the extreme radical wing of the Opposition, to the very eve of the election, coquetted with the Socialists, contributed strongly to the excessive triumph of the Government party. Another element of defeat for the Liberals lay in their stanch fidelity to free-trade principles, while their clerical adversaries were free-traders in Brussels and Antwerp, and protectionists in the manufacturing towns. Fortunately for the beaten party, the two-thirds majority of the clericals in both houses of the Legislature can only pave the way for a revision of the Constitution, but not effect it; for a revision can be carried only by a two-thirds vote in both houses of the Legislature succeeding the one which moves the amendments. It is also probable that the Conservative Government will find its victory embarrassingly sweeping. The excesses of its supporters may speedily lead to a new and thorough revulsion of public sentiment such as Belgium has so often witnessed.

SUMMARY OF THE WEEK'S NEWS.

[WEDNESDAY, June 30, to TUESDAY, July 6, 1886, inclusive.]

DOMESTIC.

PRESIDENT CLEVELAND on Thursday signed the Fitz John Porter Bill.

Congress is making more rapid progress than had been anticipated with its work, and, unless there shall be long political debates, it may be possible to adjourn by the 20th.

In the House of Representatives on Wednesday Mr. Boyle (Dem., Penn.), from the Pan-Electric Committee, submitted a report signed by four members of the Committee upon the subject of its investigation. It is accompanied by the following resolution: "Resolved, That a full, fair, and exhaustive investigation has failed to adduce any evidence which tends to show that Attorney-General Garland, Solicitor-General Goode, Secretary Lamar, Indian-Commissioner Atkins, Railroad-Commissioner Johnston, or Senator Harris (they being the officers named in the Pan-Electric publications of the newspaper press which gave rise to this investigation) did any act, official or otherwise, connected with the matter investigated which was dishonest, dishonorable, or censurable." The report was in line with the resolution. It was referred to the House calendar. The Republican members of the Committee submitted a minority report in exactly the opposite sense.

The House on Thursday refused to pass over the President's veto the bill to quiet the titles of settlers on the Des Moines River lands by 161 to 91, not the necessary two-thirds.

The House Ways and Means Committee on Tuesday ordered an adverse report to be made on the Randall Tariff Bill.

In the Senate on Thursday Mr. Riddleberger (Read., Va.) introduced a preamble and a bill for the reduction by 25 per cent. of the salaries of Cabinet officers, Senators, and Members; and addressed the Senate in its advocacy. He said that if they were to begin reductions of \$1,200 clerks and to conclude with reductions of per diem labor, it seemed to him that they should go back and begin at the head. He also referred to the contracted currency as a disadvantage to labor and an advantage to capital. The bill was referred to the Committee on Finance.

In the Senate on Friday, during the consideration of the Legislative Appropriation Bill, an amendment for an additional clerk for the Civil-Service Commission was opposed by Mr. Vance (Dem., N. C.), who remarked that, if the Commission was unable to do any more business, it would be so much the better. Mr. Saulsbury (Dem., Del.) looked upon the Civil-Service Commission from beginning to end as a useless piece of machinery; if he had his way he would repeal the law. Mr. Voorhees (Dem., Ind.) said that he had never been for the law, sleeping or waking; but, while it was a law, he would treat it fairly and give it a fair chance. If there was any good in it he hoped the good would come out. The fact would be made manifest in good time and the people would pass upon it. The amendment was adopted by 34 to 11.

The Naval Appropriation Bill, as reported in the Senate on Saturday, appropriates \$12,883,234, a net reduction of \$46,800 as compared with the House bill.

The new resolution of instructions to boards of examiners for the classified customs and postal service, which was adopted by the Civil-Service Commissioners, to go into effect on Thursday or as soon thereafter as practicable, is already causing commotion, which will undoubtedly increase. The resolution directs that every customs district board and post-office board shall nominate to the Commission on the first Thursday in July in each year "one of its members for appointment as Chairman, and one of its members for appointment as Secretary of the Board." The result of this vote is to be reported without delay to the Commission, and the persons so nominated are immediately

to enter upon the discharge of their duties, "unless the Commission shall make other appointments than those advised by the Board." One of the first results was the reorganization of the New York Custom-house Board. Both the Chairman and Secretary of the Board were Republicans and civil-service reformers. On Thursday both were displaced and Democrats elected in their places. It was reported about the Custom-house on Friday that the change was brought about in a way to justify the fears of those who look upon it as a deliberate attempt to convert the Civil-Service Board into a political machine. According to statements which appear well founded, Mr. Lyman, the only Republican member of the Civil-Service Commission at Washington, left that city for official business in the West only about a week ago, and was to return the last of this week, yet the change in the manner of designating the officers of local boards was rushed through in his absence. The responsibility for this action is laid at the door of Commissioner J. H. Oberly, who has been an active partisan politician, and used to be the Chairman of the Illinois State Democratic Committee.

Mr. Veazey, late Postmaster at Baltimore, publishes a letter in reply to Civil-Service Commissioner Lyman's recent report on his administration. He says when he entered the Post-office all of the 260 employees but six were Republicans. "My purpose," he says, "was to apply the civil-service rules to those inside of the service as well as those outside, and, as far as possible, without violating the law or sacrificing the business interests of the community, to displace all non-civil-service Republicans with civil-service Democrats. . . . The men composing the force at that time were, as a rule, faithful and efficient members of the Republican political organization, and this is the only uniform rule which can be declared with reference to them; they differed in everything except in politics. Some of them were excellent clerks, and some were admirable carriers, while others were utterly unfit for any position whatever.

I take pride and pleasure in advising your honorable Board that it is quite true that all the new appointees were appointed because they were Democrats, and I am glad to have been able to accomplish such gratifying results without affecting the efficiency of the postal service. I am sure that my course in this respect has met the approval not only of Democrats, but also of fair-minded Republicans, and I shall not concern myself as to the views of Mugwumps. I do not hesitate to acknowledge 'that I appointed Democrats because they were Democrats,' but not for that reason alone; I never appointed an incompetent or unreliable Democrat in preference to a reliable and competent Republican, and how shall Mr. Lyman say that I was guilty of discriminating when I appointed thoroughly 'honest and efficient' men?"

The Republican members of the Ohio delegation in Congress have all joined in a petition to the Senate Committee to reconsider their decision not to investigate Mr. Payne's election; and Senator Sherman has added to their request his endorsement, with the statement that he is perfectly willing to have it known what he has to say on the subject. Messrs. Butterworth and Little have also addressed a personal letter to Chairman Hoar, saying they have new and important evidence to lay before the Committee.

The Pennsylvania Republicans on Wednesday carried out the programme of the Boss Quay Machine and nominated Gen. James A. Beaver for Governor by acclamation; William T. Davies of Bradford County for Lieutenant-Governor; T. J. Stewart of Montgomery County for Secretary of Internal Affairs; A. Wilson Norris of Philadelphia for Auditor-General; and F. A. Osborne of Luzerne County for Congressman-at-Large. The platform favors the Inter-State Commerce Bill, demands the passage of a law prohibiting the importation of foreign pauper labor, calls for the pro-

tection of farm products against fraudulent imitations, and "the enactment of proper laws affording facilities for conference and arbitration based upon the principle that all men are free and equal, and directly recognizing the equality of all the interests involved—the workers, the employers, and the people at large"; arraigns the Democrats; praises the high tariff, and asks the Legislature to submit a prohibition amendment to the people.

The Arkansas Democrats on Wednesday nominated S. P. Hughes for Governor, E. P. Moore for Secretary of State, W. E. Woodruff for State Treasurer, and Daniel W. Jones for Attorney-General. The platform favors a tariff for revenue only, and unlimited coinage of silver.

The Democrats and Greenbackers in Iowa have fused, the Democrats nominating the Secretary of State, Auditor, Attorney-General, and Clerk of the Supreme Court, and the Greenbackers the Treasurer.

The Massachusetts Legislature on Wednesday passed a bill appropriating \$20,000 for entertaining President Cleveland in case he should visit the State this summer. It has adjourned its session.

Ex-President Hayes, in an address at Toledo, O., attacked President Cleveland's vetoes of fraudulent pension bills, saying that the President's action was "contrary to every tradition of the country, and one which would meet with no approval from the patriotic and the just."

Judge Barrett of this city, on Friday, sentenced the Theiss boycotters to terms of imprisonment ranging from one year and six months to three years and eight months. In pronouncing sentence Judge Barrett said: "You have violated public right and opinion. Your offence is not short of blackmail. The distribution of circulars by you in places of business is conspiracy, and punishable as such. Your conduct, if unpunished, would lead to savagery. You may have been misled by bad advice, but your counsel should have rebuked you. You did not use the money for your own advantage and this palliates your offence. I shall not impose the extreme penalty of the law."

At a meeting of the directors of the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad Company on Wednesday a letter from Cornelius Vanderbilt to President Depew was read, in which Mr. Vanderbilt said: "I have had plans prepared for a building 80 feet front by 40 feet in depth, to be used for the benefit of railroad men in the service of the companies centring at the Grand Central Depot. It will be a substantial structure, with bath-rooms, gymnasium, and bowling alleys in the basement; reading-rooms, library, room for games, and offices on the first floor; a large hall for general meetings and rooms for classes on the second floor; and rooms for janitor's family and sleeping-rooms for men coming in late or detained in the city over night in the upper story. I wish you to lay before the Board of Directors this proposition: If the company will set apart the land at the corner of Madison Avenue and Forty-fifth Street (40 feet on the street by 80 feet on the avenue) for the use and purposes for which such a building would be erected, I will bear all the expense of construction and of fitting and furnishing it ready for use." The directors authorized President Depew to accept Mr. Vanderbilt's offer and thank him.

Prof. Timothy Dwight was on Thursday inaugurated as President of Yale College. In his inaugural address he pledged himself to carry on the present policy of Yale College, looking to its development towards a great University, preserving what is best in its traditions. He spoke strongly in favor of the ancient classics.

William Walter Phelps has been reelected a member of the Yale College Corporation.

The Harvard Freshmen crew won the boat race at New London on Thursday by three lengths; Columbia second; Yale out of the

race because her boat upset at the half-mile. Yale defeated Harvard in the University boat race at the same place on Friday, and also won the intercollegiate base-ball championship by defeating Harvard at Hartford on Saturday by 7 to 1.

Paul H. Hayne, the Southern poet, is dying.

FOREIGN.

John Bright addressed a large audience at Birmingham on Thursday night. In the course of his speech he said in substance: "The Liberal leaders had generally followed the course adopted by Mr. Gladstone in preference to following their own convictions. Some intimate friends of his had no notion of anything but following where Gladstone led. They reminded him of Cook's tourists, who enjoyed great security because they were 'personally conducted.' The old story of Ireland had nothing to do with the question. It was unbecoming in the Premier to make a long speech telling what had happened in Ireland a century ago. Going back would show the enormous progress of Ireland during the past fifty and even twenty years. The whole tone of Parliament towards Ireland had altered. He said he was entirely against anything in any shape called a Parliament at Dublin. He was also opposed to the monstrous proposition to purchase estates. But for the bill to revolutionize Ireland, nobody would have dreamed of so extravagant a proposal. In regard to the land, the political scheme made the economic scheme necessary. While the economic proposals were condemned, the political bills proposed would create a government in Ireland that would be untrustworthy as regards the first duties of government, namely, the preservation of property and the security of public order. Mr. Bright proceeded to suggest, as an alternative to the Government's proposals, that a permanent committee of Irish members be formed, and that Irish bills after the first reading be referred to this committee. The committee shall have a special place of meeting at Westminster, appoint its own chairman, and have power to decide whether a bill is acceptable. No English or Scotch member shall be appointed on the committee. The House shall only have power to consider a bill on a report of the committee. He admitted that the plan was simple, and depended upon the honest working of the Irish party in combination in the House of Commons. Assuming that there was a moderate loyal spirit in the Irish party, the plan would succeed, but if Irishmen were disloyal, neither this nor the Government plan would succeed. His suggestion might be called one of the unexhausted resources of civilization which should be tried before they capitulated to one of the worst conspiracies that ever afflicted any country."

Mr. Gladstone has written a letter to Mr. John Bright, in which he says: "I am sorry to be compelled to again address you. In your speech at Birmingham you charge me with having successfully concealed my thoughts last November. You ought to know that this is not a fact, for in reply to others, from whom this gross charge was more to be expected than from you, I pointed out that on November 9 I told my electors in Edinburgh that if the Irish elections went as I expected, the magnitude of the subject they would bring forward would throw all others in the shade, and that it went down to the very roots and foundations of our whole civil and political constitution. Do you now adhere to your accusation? Second. You say that I described a 'conspiracy' now existing in Ireland as marching through rapine to break up the kingdom. This also is contrary to fact. In 1881 there was, in my opinion, such a conspiracy against the payment of rent in union counties, and I so described it. In my opinion there is no such conspiracy now, nor anything in the least degree resembling it. You put into my mouth words which, coming from me, would be absolute falsehoods. Third, you charge me with a want of frankness because I have not

pledged the Government to some defined line of action in regard to the Land Bill. A charge of this kind as between old colleagues and friends is, to say the least, unusual. Evidently you have not read the bill or my speech introducing it, and you have never been concerned in the practical work of legislation on difficult and complicated subjects. The foundation of your charge is that on such a subject I do not, in the midst of overwhelming work, formulate at once a new course and method of action without consulting my colleagues. It might have occurred to you, who have been in the Cabinet, that such a course on my part would have been indecent and disloyal, and that I should greatly prefer to bear all the charges and suspicions which you, unexpectedly, are the man to fasten on me. For you state that you are convinced that it is my intention to thrust the Land Bill through Parliament. If I am a man capable of such intention, I wonder that you ever took office with one so ignorant of the spirit of the Constitution and so arbitrary in character."

Lord Salisbury has written for publication a letter denying in detail every assertion made by Mr. Parnell concerning the alleged negotiations made on behalf of the late Conservative Government to secure Irish support in return for the concession of home rule. In a speech in London Lord Salisbury said that he discussed the question of autonomy with Lord Carnarvon two days before the latter had his interview with Mr. Parnell, and that he (Salisbury) had emphatically assured Lord Carnarvon that the Government could not possibly entertain the proposition to grant Ireland autonomy. He wished to repel Mr. Gladstone's suggestion that Lord Carnarvon had done anything not consistent with most scrupulous honor. Lord Carnarvon had informed him of what had passed in the interview with Mr. Parnell. The information exactly coincided with Lord Carnarvon's statement in the House of Lords. He told Carnarvon in the interview with him that his objection was so strong that even if the Conservatives adopted a policy in favor of a Parliament in Dublin, he would refuse to join the Ministry.

Mr. Parnell addressed a large meeting at Wrexham on Thursday. In the course of his speech he said: "When I parted with the Earl of Carnarvon, then Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, I left the conference feeling that he favored the Irish cause, and that a home-rule bill and a land-purchase act would be passed by the Conservatives with Irish votes before the end of the session, with the obnoxious clause cancelled, but in the shape I had demanded on behalf of the Irish party. I had besides this the strongest reasons to believe that the Tories would have given Ireland home rule if they had been successful at the polls. If coercion be continued in Ireland, the national sentiment will be increased among the Irish people until it becomes uncrushable. Home rule, on the other hand, will unite the two countries in bonds of love and amity."

The British Parliamentary elections began on Thursday, most of the elections on that day being uncontested. There was one exception, at Colchester, where the Conservative candidate defeated the Liberal by a majority of 295, an increased majority of 129. But the Unionist total was less than the total Conservative poll of last year. On Friday a most desperate electoral struggle between the Gladstonites and the Unionists ended by the utter rout of the latter in the Parliamentary district known as the Leith Burghs. Mr. W. Jacks was returned to the last Parliament as a regular Liberal by a majority of 3,870, in a total poll of 8,840 votes. He opposed the Home-Rule Bill, but was nevertheless considered invincible in his district, and was nominated in the present canvass as a Unionist to continue his opposition to the Premier's Irish policy. The Tories left the field clear to Mr. Jacks. It was hard to find a candidate to oppose him, but at the last hour allowed by law Mr. Gladstone consented to run himself.

Mr. Jacks became scared and withdrew, and Mr. Gladstone was elected without opposition. He was also returned from Midlothian. Mr. Parnell and Mr. Maurice Healy (Parnellite) were reelected to represent Cork City in the House of Commons. They were not opposed.

The Gladstonians were confident that they should maintain their hold on Scotland. Their victory in Dundee was decisive, and agents reported that the agricultural vote was safe for the Ministerialists. But on Monday the Glasgow Radicals revoked. Of the seven contests in that city the Unionists carried three. Mr. Bradlaugh and Mr. Labouchere have been returned from Northampton, the former by an increased majority. Sir Charles Dilke was on Monday defeated at Chelsea by Mr. Whitmore, Conservative, the vote standing 4,304 to 4,128. This result has caused a sensation in political circles. In many constituencies the Gladstonian majorities have been reduced 1,000. The tendency of Monday's elections was so strong against Mr. Gladstone that the Liberals became much disheartened. Prof. Thorold Rogers was unexpectedly defeated. C. E. Lewis, Conservative, was reelected in Londonderry over Justin McCarthy, Parnellite, by a vote of 1,826 to 1,724. In the last election the same candidates contested the district, when Mr. Lewis won by a vote of 1,824 against that of 1,795 for Mr. McCarthy. After the result was announced, a ballot-box which had not been counted was discovered. A recount gave Mr. Lewis a majority of only 3. A riot ensued. The police interfered, and a large number of people were injured.

Among the encouraging features of Tuesday's elections for the home-rulers was the defeat of the Right Hon. George J. Goschen, one of Mr. Gladstone's bitterest Unionist opponents, in the East Division of Edinburgh, by Mr. Wallace, the Gladstonian candidate, by a majority of 1,339 in a total of 5,937. In the last election Mr. Goschen was elected as a Liberal by a majority of 2,408 in a total vote of 6,266. Mr. John Morley, Chief Secretary for Ireland, has been reelected from Newcastle-upon-Tyne by a vote of 10,681, an increase of 552 in his vote. At midnight Tuesday the Tories had elected 210 candidates, the Unionists 43, the Gladstonians 99, and the Parnellites 43. The net Tory gain at that hour was 21.

A riot at the Conservative Workmen's Club-house in Dublin on Monday evening was provoked by men in the Club. A Catholic procession passed the Club-house, which was crowded with men at the time. They attacked the procession with bottles. This attack was answered with threats and some stones. The Club people then literally showered bottles at the procession, and also fired a number of shots into it from revolvers. More than twenty were injured. The police surrounded the house, getting control of the premises, and finally arrested seventy of the inmates.

The German imperial revenue for the fiscal year 1885-1886 will, it is calculated, fall 17,000,000 marks below the estimate. The deficiency is attributed to a decrease, amounting to 20,000,000 marks, in the revenue derived from the sugar tax. The taxes on salt, beer, and spirits show an increase in their yields to the treasury. The new sugar tax law will, it is thought, produce an addition of 16,000,000 marks to the revenue.

The Servian peasantry generally are rioting. They refuse to pay the taxes levied since the unsuccessful war against Bulgaria, and maltreat the tax collectors. Their hostility to King Milan's Government is continually fomented by the Opposition party.

Owing to the greater strictness with which internal and customs revenues are being collected, Mexican treasury officials assert that the new fiscal year will show from 10 to 15 per cent. gain, which will amount to nearly \$3,000,000 addition to the Federal revenues. President Diaz feels encouraged at the outlook and at the prospect of the establishment of national credit.

TWENTY-ONE YEARS.

THE national anniversary of 1886 is the twenty-first since that which immediately followed the downfall of the rebellion. The nation has thus come to its majority in the new existence which began with the end of the civil war and the abolition of slavery. The intervening period has been in a sense one of nonage, and it is hardly fanciful to regard the reunited nation as having only now come to the full stature of manhood.

For the first time in their history the people of the United States now feel an assured confidence in the perpetuity and safety of the nation. The danger of disunion shadowed the whole existence of the republic down to the war; the fear that irreparable harm might yet be done the country by the section which attempted secession has possessed a large share of the population since the war. One thing alone could demonstrate the integrity of the reunited nation, and that was proof that its government was as secure with the party which was strongest in the South in power as with the party which was strongest in the North. So long as hundreds of thousands of men believed that a party which contained half the people would plunge the country into ruin if it should come into power, real confidence in the republic could not exist. Nothing short of a year's peaceful administration of the Government by the party which they so dreaded could convince these hundreds of thousands of men that the country is truly safe. This test has been applied, and a host of people are drawing long breaths of relief at the evidence that their honest apprehensions were baseless, and that there are no longer any "rebels" against whom they must "vote as they shot." It is simple truth to say that there is now a more general, settled, and well-grounded confidence in the future of the republic than ever before since it was established.

This confidence largely grows out of the discovery that the nation no longer has a negro problem to settle. Before the war, slavery always threatened the attempt at secession which was finally made; for some time after the war emancipation did not give assurance of the black man's future. The race still suffers keenly from injustice, and it will long be handicapped sadly by its generations of servitude. But experience has shown that the negro is as safe with one party in power at Washington as with the other, and that his former masters are ready to give his children the education which is seen to be as essential for them as for the whites, in the interest of the latter quite as much as in that of the blacks. The education of colored children in free schools maintained at the public expense by the old slave States is proof that the negro problem is at last in process of solution.

Still another great gain is the staggering blow which has been dealt at the domination of the spoils theory of popular government. Pernicious and demoralizing as this theory was when originally formulated two generations ago, it was not until the population had reached 50,000,000, and the number of offices exceeded 100,000, that people realized all the dangers which it threatened. The "clean

sweep" demand typified and embodied the doctrine of the spoilsmen, and when a new administration, involving a change of parties for the first time in a quarter of a century, refused to make a "clean sweep," the axe was laid at the root of the evil. A vast deal remains to be done before we shall have a thoroughgoing reform of the civil service, but the spoilsmen have already met their Waterloo—and they show that they know it.

There are dark shades as well as light in the national picture. While the black labor of the South is emerging from ignorance, the North is awakening to the danger of ignorant white labor. The fact that great bodies of men in the East and West have avowed and endeavored by force to establish the doctrine that a man shall not have the right to earn a living unless he subjects himself to the odious despotism of a secret, oath-bound "union," is an unwelcome revelation of the lack of intelligence among the masses of the newcomers from abroad. A body of workmen who had been educated in the public schools of this country would never have tolerated such a proposition, and while some native-born Americans have participated in the recent assertions of this doctrine, its chief strength has been found among the ignorant laborers who have come to us from the lowest classes of every European nation. The work of emancipating such men from the shackles of ignorance is no small task.

The growth in the power of corporations is an unhealthy sign. The undue influence of these great aggregations of capital in our legislation, the demoralizing effect of their methods upon public men, are plain to the most careless observer. The wide ramifications of more than one vast monopoly, as they are sometimes exposed to view, are well calculated to alarm the timid. It is not strange that people are found who consider the dangers threatened by corporate power hardly second to the worst that the country has yet encountered.

The admiration—even the worship—of wealth, which characterizes a large share of the population, is a sign of the times which the thoughtful observer must note. Material success, as evidenced in the possession of a great fortune, is undoubtedly more highly valued now than ever before. The very rich man is the popular hero to an extent previously quite unknown in this country, and hardly ever equalled elsewhere. A million dollars now invest the most ordinary person with a degree of consideration which the most commanding talent may not insure the poor man, and too often ability stands no chance in a contest with a long purse when the two appeal for what should be that loftiest mark of public esteem—a high office in the State.

The "spread-eagle" oratory of the Fourth of July in the era before the war has gone out of vogue. The sobering effect of that great struggle is reflected in the quieter treatment of the anniversary. There was always something hollow about the oratory of that bygone period, for speaker and hearers alike realized, even if they tried to forget, the absurdity of celebrating the birth of freedom in a land which permitted slavery. The orator "let the eagle scream," and the audience applauded the national bird, in

the hope of forgetting the "irrepressible conflict" of which everybody dreaded to think. The conflict having at last come and ended, so long ago that the baby then born is now a full-grown man, we approach the anniversary with a well-grounded confidence such as our ancestors never felt. If we do not make so much noise as they did fifty years ago, it is because we have learned that it is wiser to reflect upon the dangers which still confront us than to pretend that the republic has yet reached perfection. The comforting reflection is always present, however, that no peril can exceed those which we have escaped, and that a nation really united and free is prepared to meet any dangers.

SOME CRITICS OF THE GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

THE invocation of the Divine blessing on our enemies is a natural accompaniment of the prayer to be delivered from our friends, and if there is a man living whom a decent sense of gratitude should move to pronounce that invocation, it is Maj. Powell, Director of the Geological Survey. This officer is now intrusted with the annual expenditure of a lump sum of \$400,000, in his own way, through agencies selected by himself, in the preparation of a geological map of the United States. In deciding what a geologic map is, and how it is to be made, what regions should be first covered, what agencies to employ; in the adoption of methods of administration and in the fixing of compensations to be paid, he is subject to no legal limitation or control whatever, except such as the Secretary of the Interior may be able to exercise. Not two months ago it was authoritatively reported as the unanimous opinion of the joint commission on the survey that this power should be in some way restricted. And yet, last week, a proviso intended to limit the expenditure of the money strictly to the object named in the appropriation was voted down, with so near an approach to unanimity that not even a count was called for. Two days later the Committee on Appropriations in the Senate recommended a reduction of the Director's salary by \$1,000. On a division this recommendation only received five votes. We doubt if there is any instance in the history of the country of an officer of the Government, in time of peace, exercising such powers and receiving such an endorsement in both houses of Congress.

If we ask why this endorsement was so emphatic, the natural answer will be that Congress was willing for the moment to sacrifice the usual precautionary provisions in making appropriations, for the sake of leaving untrammelled the administration of an officer whom they knew to be executing the duties of his office with the highest ability and integrity. If we go still further, and inquire why this confidence, we shall find it to be very largely the result of a series of unfounded attacks upon the Survey which have been made in various journals during the past twelve months. If there was anything open to criticism in the Director's conduct of his work, the authors of these attacks were singularly unfortunate in failing either to bring it to light or to guess at it. The published statements of the Director himself, and the result of examinations both by officers of the Treasury and of the

Interior Departments, show that all adverse statements were either pure fabrications and random guesses, or were founded on misconstruction of the law or of the facts. The more completely the affairs of the bureau were looked into, the less room was found for criticism. The natural result was that the principle involved was entirely overlooked in the reaction against such a mass of falsehood. Congress is evidently convinced that the present Director knows better how to spend his appropriations than Congress can tell him, and is not disposed to frame laws which, while guarding against the abuse of his trust by a careless and incompetent officer, would only trammel a careful and efficient one.

Under these circumstances we regret the publication of an ill-advised criticism of the Survey just issued from the Government Printing Office by the Chief of Engineers. Nominally, it consists of extracts from the report of Capt. George M. Wheeler upon the International Geographical Conference held at Venice in 1881. The extracts, however, are really a republication of the whole book except the sixty pages devoted to the work of the Congress. Why those were omitted, it is difficult to say. The body of the work is a description of the Government land and marine surveys of the leading countries of the world, including the United States. The moral of the story is everywhere kept in the foreground, and is, that in all countries, except our own, topographical surveys are under the direction of the military branch of the Government, and marine surveys under the naval branch. This moral is so obtrusive as to detract from the confidence the reader should be able to repose in the fulness and fairness of the statements. Lest it should be forgotten, it is reinforced by "little digs" at the scientific men of our own country. Capt. Wheeler speaks of the fashion among a certain class of scientific official specialists in the United States, who apply the name Geodetic Survey to a portion of their work. He tells us that no general topographical survey on a trigonometrical basis for the United States has yet been instituted. As the Geological Survey has for several years past been carrying on this work, we must charitably interpret this statement as meaning that no official knowledge of such a survey is in the possession of Captain Wheeler's department. Our readers will recollect the curious fact that the Engineers' Survey ten years ago had no official knowledge of the work of the Hayden Survey, but went on resurveying the regions which Hayden had already completed.

What connection the report on marine surveys has with any work of the Corps of Engineers or with the Geographical Congress, it is difficult to see. It looks very much as if this part of the report were an afterthought, prepared exclusively to support the project for transferring the Coast Survey to the Navy Department, which would be the natural complement of transferring the work of the Geological Survey to the War Department. A rapid glance at it shows no information which could not have been as readily compiled in Washington as in the countries in question. Of the Coast

Survey Capt. Wheeler says: "In the United States the anomaly exists of a hydrographic survey *legally* consisting of a civilian head, with primarily army and navy officers and astronomers, etc., as assistants, under the administration of the Treasury Department." Following the example of the rest of the report, the main object is to make it evident to the reader that all marine surveying is in foreign countries conducted by naval officers under the respective navy departments. The report is made as available as possible for home use by placing in the background, or entirely ignoring, the most essential feature in which the organization of these foreign services differs from that proposed for our own in the event of its transfer to the Navy Department. They are, for the most part, not made or directed by "sailor men," officers in the line of naval command, but by a selected and specially trained "staff corps" which our navy has not and does not intend to have. Thus Capt. F. J. O. Evans, R. N., who is named in the report as Hydrographer to the Admiralty, was a "staff captain," who, in the order of command of a ship at sea, would have been preceded by any lieutenant on board. The Hydrographic Office of England is, in fact, not classed as naval at all, but as one of the civil branches of the Admiralty. In France the surveying is, for the most part, not conducted by sea-going officers at all, but by the corps of hydrographic engineers ("ingénieurs hydrographiques"), who never had a naval education. In Germany, also, the chief of the Hydrographic Office belongs to the "marine staff," and his office is a permanent one. All this is very different from our plan of having sea-going officers of the line take their turn in conducting the work of the Coast Survey for three years at a time, as they command a navy-yard or a ship; and Capt. Wheeler, by ignoring it, deprives his report of all the weight it should have as an official paper.

THE RAILWAY POSTAL SERVICE.

For some unexplained reason the railway postal service was not covered by the civil-service rules when the present Administration came into power. It ought to have been, but it was not. There is no reason in the world why clerks in the large post-offices should be appointed and promoted by competitive examination, and the clerks in the railway postal service should not. On the contrary, the service rendered by the railway clerks is even more laborious, and calls for greater skill, intelligence, integrity, and bodily endurance, than that rendered by the clerks in the post-offices.

Mr. Vilas ought, when he came into office, to have obtained from the President an order putting this branch of the service also under the rules, in view of its very great importance to the public, and especially the commercial public, to whom the prompt delivery of letters is a matter of so much concern. The whole railway postal service is in fact organized and exists for the promotion of promptness. It sorts the mails en route, and therefore makes a clear saving of the time, which would be passed in this way in the post-office. But this sorting is

done under great difficulties—that is, is done with defective light and under the oscillation caused by the rapid motion of the train, and much of it is done at night, and therefore calls for strong eyes, vigorous bodily health, and thorough devotion to duty.

Mr. Vilas seems to have been fully conscious of all this when he came into office. Whether he sought to have this branch of the service brought under the rules we do not know, but he issued the following order within a few weeks after taking charge of the Post-office:

"March 31, 1885.—Railway postal clerks who have become efficient and valuable men, against whom no just complaint of neglect, inattention, or want of fidelity, honesty, or efficiency can be brought, need have no fears of being disturbed so long as they continue to render meritorious and faithful service."

Now, we are sorry to say that he does not appear to have lived up to this order for a single month. From the very first this most important branch of the public service was in a greater or less degree given up to the politicians. They were allowed to make it a receptacle for the worthless henchmen whom they could not, in the old fashion, get into the great post-offices covered by the rules. Railway postal clerks who "had become efficient and valuable men," and against whom "no just complaints" could be made, have been not only "disturbed," but removed to make room for new and untried men, who had nothing to recommend them but their political influence. Men who have rendered and were rendering "meritorious and faithful service" have found that it did not protect them against arbitrary dismissal. In other words, the Postmaster-General's pledges have proved valueless, and because valueless, a discredit instead of an honor to him and to the Administration.

This is not all, nor the worst of the matter. The state of disorganization and inefficiency they brought about in the railway service has of course done much to deprive the public of the benefit of the greater efficiency introduced into the large post-offices by the new rules. No matter how well the work of the New York Post-office is done, for instance, in making up and despatching the mails, it may be largely wasted or neutralized by the inefficiency of the sorters in the mail-cars on the roads. We can testify as a matter of experience that this is true. Irregularities and delays in the transmission of the newspaper mails have increased during the past year, and we have found almost invariably that they were due to diminished efficiency in the railway postal service.

The postal clerks have organized a trades-union, and are threatening a strike unless the Postmaster-General redresses certain specified grievances, the principal of which is the repeated violations of the promise which we have quoted above. We are as much opposed as any one can be to the formation of unions with striking powers, among any body of men engaged in a public service. No policeman, or railway official, or telegrapher ought, we hold, to consider himself at liberty to join in any movement against his employers which involves the infliction of enormous loss and inconvenience on the public. Anybody who tries or arranges to make his private quarrels a

public calamity richly deserves the punishment of a public enemy or traitor. But we are bound to say that if a strike among public servants could ever be justifiable, it would be among the railway postal clerks. They have been badly treated, and in treating them badly Mr. Vilas has shown an indifference to the public interests which has sorely disappointed his best friends. We can hardly expect, and he can hardly expect, the Postal Clerks' Union or "Brotherhood" to consider the loss and inconvenience they will inflict on the public by striking, when he has considered them so little as to let politicians get into the mail cars. It is high time for this wretched scandal to cease, and we trust that if Mr. Vilas does not feel equal to cope with it, the President will take it in hand and make an end of it.

RICH COLLEGIANS.

THE very burning question of the influence of rich young men in college came up once more at the commencement dinner at Harvard the other day. The Chairman, Mr. Leverett Saltonstall, started the subject in his address by saying:

"With this great growth and these improvements have followed other changes, which I regret to say are of a nature to fill us with anxiety. I refer especially to the growth of luxury and extravagance among the students.

"This is doubtless the natural result of the enormous increase of wealth and the rapid accumulation of vast fortunes. Not only has the old simplicity of life vanished, and habits of economy, so important to the sons of the rich, as well as to those of moderate means, been destroyed, but much of that kindly feeling which used to exist between members of a class has been lost.

"Brothers, I speak plainly on this subject because I consider it an evil which cannot be remedied by faculty or overseers, but only by the good sense and united action of those who send their sons hither. It is, I know, impossible to return to the simplicity and cordial feeling of former college days, for it must be within the college walls much as it is outside of them. The number of students is four or fivefold greater than in my day. The college is rapidly growing into a great university. Still, it is to be hoped that some strong effort may be made to remedy this great evil by all who care for the college."

President Eliot sought to break the force of this criticism by remarking on the other side:

"It is true that there has been a deplorable increase of luxury among a small fraction of the students of the university. No one can deplore it more than the college faculty; nevertheless, let me point out that it is an exceedingly small fraction of the college against whom this charge can be made. In the first place, not more than 10 per cent. of the college students can on any principle be called rich. A great many people have a totally erroneous impression about the average character of the Harvard students in this regard. They think that all the students are rich men's sons. Nothing could be further from the truth. Among those students who may fairly be called rich there is also a large percentage of the sons of families who know how to use riches—who have been accustomed to them; and the evil of which the president of the day justly complained arises from a small fraction even of those who are rich, who are generally the sons of people who have had no experience in the possession of riches. [Applause.]

"Now, the great bulk of the students of Harvard College are the sons of people in moderate circumstances. But, going beyond them, I find that nearly one in five of all the students of the college has been aided from scholarship, beneficiary, or loan funds—nearly one in five of the entire number of students. They have been aided because neither they nor their families can afford to support them here completely, and meet all the expenses of their education."

Mr. Saltonstall's statement of the case would not have been complete without President Eliot's. People undoubtedly do exaggerate

very much the numbers and activity of the undergraduates at Harvard who spend large allowances extravagantly. Many parents of modest means hesitate much about sending a boy there, in the belief that he will be surrounded by the sons of millionaires living like Sybarites, and looking down on poor scholars. The truth is that not only, as President Eliot points out, is the number of rich men's sons small, but the number of the sons of vulgar rich men—that is, of men who have recently acquired money, and do not know how to spend it—is still smaller. The great bulk of the students are men of small means striving to get an education through great self-denial either on their own part or that of their friends. One-fifth of them, or nearly a whole class, are actually helped through college by the aid of some sort of gift or endowment.

This is all true, but it is also true that college extravagance is not only an evil, but a growing evil, and it ought somehow to be checked or abated. The number of men who are acquiring great fortunes in all parts of the country without possessing any of the traditions of refined or dignified living, is larger and larger every day. After they have got over the effects of the first sweets of wealth, the fine houses, the numerous horses and vehicles, and the yachts, and the diamonds for the wives, they turn their attention to "social position" for the "boys," and if possible—that is, if the boys are not too old or too spoiled to submit to preparation for college—they send them to Harvard. It is only very rarely that the sons of such men have the habits, or aims, or the kind of ambition necessary to make successful students; so, in order to enable them to make a figure of some kind, the father loads them with money. He gives them sometimes larger incomes than the President or any of the professors—larger than 90 per cent. of professional men make by hard labor. He gives it to them, too, with the intention that they shall make a show with it. Thence come the luxurious clubs, the rooms furnished like boudoirs, the horses, the dog-carts, the thousand little ways of spending money easily and carelessly, which now are characteristic of "the Harvard man" of a certain type. The example of all this does not touch the poor fellows who are holding on to college by the skin of their teeth, and, scorning delights and living laborious days as the only means of avoiding instant ruin. They see all this splendor afar off, and spend few thoughts on it. But it does greatly increase the difficulty which the very large class of young men of more moderate means, who come more or less in contact with the gilded youth, without actually belonging to the same set, and who may be extravagant now and again without perishing, experience in living within their incomes, and in buckling down to their work on fine days. It makes the college clubs, which are now nearly as luxurious as the Somerset or the Knickerbocker, more and more attractive, and the study and the library less and less so. It greatly increases the importance of knowledge of wines, and cigars, and liqueurs; and, worse than all, it breeds a certain very thinly veiled con-

tempt for the man who "grinds" over the college curriculum, as compared to "the man of the world," who knows what is going on in "society." How far this influence goes in college, it is of course impossible to say. But no one who knows college life well will deny that it is wide-reaching, and that the number of those who are not in some degree touched by it, and find their lives made harder by it, is small.

It also undoubtedly has much to do with the extraordinary interest in the athletic sports. These sports are actually carried on in every college by a very small number of men. All that the others have to do with them is to contribute money towards the expenses, and travel long distances to act as "shouters" at the various inter-collegiate contests. Indeed, the extent to which participation in what is called "college life" is now confined to subscribing money to clubs, societies, and crews, and teams of various sorts, is something startling. Of course the rich men are more active in getting up things to subscribe to, and subscribe more than anybody else. Consequently the more the glory of the college becomes dependent on subscriptions, the more does wealth aid a man in becoming a college model and champion.

What the Faculty can do to remedy this state of things it is hard to say. But it undoubtedly can do something. We doubt if an appeal to rich parents on the subject of allowances would be thrown away, except in the case of the coarsest and most ignorant. All wealthy fathers who had ever tasted mental cultivation themselves—and they now furnish a large body of undergraduates—would certainly respond to it. The clubs surely, too, could be subjected without difficulty to some kind of sumptuary regulation, which would prevent their being close copies of the clubs in all the great cities. Moreover, what is there to prevent the Faculty requesting a young man who is distinguishing himself by his extravagant expenditure, to withdraw, just as if he drank too much or was licentious, on the simple ground that his example was pernicious? We believe it would be easy for any college in the country to be made so unpleasant for the luxurious idlers that they would keep clear of it, without instituting a very rigid censorship of anybody's personal tastes or habits. And it would do a world of good to many a groping millionaire to be taught sharply that in the new world which he had entered, money was not the supreme good.

THE METAPHYSICS OF CHAUVINISM.

AN anonymous writer in the Berlin *Gegenwart* has lately been giving to the world some very curious literature. He writes under the heading, "If so, so be it," and takes the field ostensibly for the purpose of discussing the ability of Germany to meet France in another war. Upon taking up an essay so labelled, one who is familiar with the traditions of this sort of writing thinks at once that he knows what is awaiting him. He expects an array of facts and figures, with perhaps such an expression of defiance or of solicitude as these facts and figures seem to call for. He expects an estimate of each party's strength in men and munitions of war; a comparative statement concerning infantry and cavalry, concerning guns small and great, and concerning ironclads and torpedoes. He ex-

pects, also, that the relative quality of these destructive appliances, and that questions of organization, discipline, and generalship, will be duly taken into consideration. Finally, he will be on the lookout for some confident remarks regarding the relative bravery of each party's men. Such are commonly thought to be, though the list makes no pretence to being exhaustive, the main sources of an army's strength. Now these, with the exception of the last, are all, so to speak, physical factors. The strength of an army is supposed to have as its basis the physical force represented by the men who compose it and the tools they use. What military science does is partly in the way of increasing the amount of force that can be wielded by a given number of men, and partly in the way of teaching them how to use this force more effectively than they otherwise would. The science is still chiefly a matter of skill in the manipulation of physical forces.

That the moral quality of the individual soldier is likewise a factor in the strength of an army, is of course no secret, and there are many historical instances in which this seems to have been the great and decisive factor. But, with all deference for the lessons of history, there would appear to be no need of any confusion of mind as to what is meant when the phrase "moral quality" is used in such a connection. It means little more than willingness to face death under orders, and this is a quality dependent almost entirely upon previous discipline. It has little to do with character in the higher import of that word; little to do, that is, with the general condition of the soldier's ethical, aesthetic, and scientific faculties. It has also less to do than we are prone to imagine with the soldier's deliberate, reasoned conviction regarding the value of that for which he supposes himself to be fighting. It may be agreeable to polite vanity to think that a company of gentlemen can whip a regiment of clowns, just because the gentlemen are gentlemen and the clowns are clowns. It is, however, not true, especially if the clowns have the better tools and are themselves officered by gentlemen. The familiar generalization that France was beaten in 1870 by the German universities, has undoubtedly some truth in it; only we must beware of concluding that the decisive fact in the war was in the relative culture of the private soldiers engaged on either side. Culture goes down before superior shooting.

These remarks are not put forward as anything revolutionary; on the contrary, they are supposed to reflect the general opinion of the time in matters military. We were therefore surprised and straightway interested when we found a countryman of Bismarck apparently arguing that the most important factor in successful war is the moral character of the soldier. We say "apparently," since we are constrained to gather the writer's meaning from out the sinuosities, obscurities, and general splay-footedness of the most atrocious style it has ever been our lot to encounter even in a German periodical. Divested (in part at least) of its vagueness and of its metaphysical subtleties, the author's drift is something like this: War is a mode of national self-affirmation, and as such is not an evil but a blessing. It contributes to the national welfare in the same measure that an equal putting forth of strength in peaceful ways would contribute. Self-affirmation, or struggle for existence, being the law of the world, one nation has a right to make war upon and conquer another simply to assert its own superior title to leadership in the world's affairs. Victory goes to the worthiest, and is, in fact, nature's certificate of a people's fitness to live. It would, however, be a mistake to suppose that worthiness or fitness to live is identical with physical strength. It is rather a

compound of physical strength and of various moral and intellectual qualities, the sum total of which our philosopher calls virility of culture (*Männlichkeit der Kultur*). Virility of culture is really the great desideratum if a nation is to "overcome the obstacles which hinder its free development," or, in other words, if it is to conquer its enemies in war. And this desideratum, so far as masses of men are concerned, must be secured by an educational process. The individual must be taught patriotism by being taught the value of his country's culture and the grandeur of his country's mission to the world. When he is so taught he will not only wish to see his fatherland prevailing among the nations of the earth, but he will be ready to contribute his own life to this end when need arises. The writer concludes in a hortatory strain:

"Let us nourish the soldier with all the true, the beautiful, and the good in our culture, so that he may know of it and may carry it against the enemy on the battle-field. Let him be given, not narcotic drinks, but enduring strength to meet death. There need be no fear of his becoming imbued with an excess of romantic idealism. It is an old experience that, in order to hit the good, we must aim at the best; and that which is best in man and best worth preserving springs from his idealism. . . . All work for civilization is of the nature of battle against that which is of inferior value. Let us do each his own part that the virility of German culture may surpass that of France, and we shall beat France in battle. *In hoc signo vinces.*"

This manner of talking would have, perhaps, but little interest were it simply an isolated expression of patriotic ardor. But it is more than that. It shows us the mental condition to which large numbers of intelligent Germans—men, too, of naturally humane instincts—are being brought by the brutal logic of contemporary European politics. These men are coming to look upon the present policy of blood, and iron, and defiance, not as a reproach to humanity, to be defended at best only on grounds of temporary necessity, but as really the last and highest word of civilization concerning the way in which the nations of the earth should dwell together. And so they talk to us, not of the hideousness and brutality of war, but of its dignity, majesty, and momentous bearing upon the self-consciousness of a people. We hear learned professors, who would certainly prefer to be gentle with a kitten, discoursing upon the ethico-social value of military discipline, and upon the beautiful upbuilding in manliness which comes of having gone through a course of training the ultimate purpose of which is to enable a people to slaughter its neighbors in as large numbers and with as much despatch as possible, whenever diplomatic lubricity shall give the signal. It is painful indeed to find men of culture, who have inherited the humanistic traditions of the great era of German letters, engaging in the abominable work of gilding with the language of poetry and philosophy that which is nothing more than the morality of the prize-ring (or say, rather, of a herd of swine) exalted into a canon of international politics. Especially painful is it, at least to the scholar, to find these men perverting the lessons of history, and misusing the inferences of natural science, in the interest of a national ideal which is radically false, and false because it is brutal instead of human. In ethics what is inhuman is wrong. It makes no difference what view one may take with regard to the ultimate nature of ethical sanctions; settle that question as we will, there is still a difference between a man and a hog, and that difference is as well worth accenting in the national as in the individual life.

From the poet we naturally expect poetry. Readers of that amiable dreamer, Novalis, will perhaps recall this deliverance: "War in general seems to me a poetic transaction. The people

think they must fight on account of some paltry possession or other, and they do not know that the Genius of Romance is driving them on to bring about a mutual destruction of ineptitudes. They do but bear arms in the cause of poetry, and both armies follow an invisible banner." To the purely historical vision there seems a measure of truth in what Novalis says. At least we can affirm that what he says is *sometimes* so. Often in the history of humanity has some bloody battle been the starting-point and apparently the indispensable preliminary condition of a glorious career of national achievement. Who can estimate the value of Marathon and Salamis in the national life of Greece? And, we must admit, it is not alone from the great battles in behalf of life or liberty, not alone from those defensive struggles which the moral sense of men instantly approves, that good has come in the process of the years. Wanton wars have also brought blessings in their train, and in such cases posterity is wont to deal more and more gently with the wantonness. Looking back to the greatness of the foundations that were laid by the Seven Years' War, history judges more and more leniently the morality of Frederick's first invasion of Silesia. One may even see reason to think that the Franco-German war of 1870 has proved of prodigious benefit to both the parties concerned. In these cases, perhaps, and in many others that might be named, the soldiers who fought, followed indeed an invisible banner, and wrought better than they knew. But can we affirm that this is always so? How about the Thirty Years' War, the Succession Wars, the Crimean War? How about the greater part of the fighting that men have been doing ever since we know anything about their history? Does any sane man, surveying the whole field of history as thoroughly as one man can, find there reason to conclude that the cultivation of the military spirit has been for the good of mankind? That we can see how the Power that rules the world occasionally transmutes the poison of human brutality into food for humanity, is no reason why we should systematically expect this result, and so put our faith altogether in poison.

Let the deep and sagacious German mind not be deceived by its own historical learning. If there be apparently some truth in Bulwer's saying that the "frenzy of the nations is the statesmanship of fate," that is only because fate has had so much of frenzy and so little of anything else to work with. It is the business of nations, as of individuals, to be ruled less and less by frenzy and more and more by reason and humanity; and as they advance in this direction the "statesmanship of fate" can be trusted to take on a fairer aspect than it has hitherto assumed. In the other direction, the direction of fighting, nothing is to be hoped for. We began with that ages ago, and the naked fact may as well be recognized that the propensity for fighting is a relic of animalism. What we need is to get rid of this propensity as rapidly as possible, and to put it behind us forever; not to call it by fine names and to incorporate it with our highest ideal of human perfection. No; neither Germany nor any other country has a valuable legacy for posterity which needs to make its way by the aid of gunpowder and dynamite.

THE YALE-HARVARD UNIVERSITY RACE.

NEW LONDON, Conn, July 2.

WHEN Mr. Rives, the referee, called the eight into line at six o'clock this evening, the sight of the two shells lying at the very foot of the grand stand on Winthrop's Point must have suggested

to more than one old graduate the college regattas away back in the "sixties," when Harvard and Yale, rowing three miles with a turn, started and finished their annual race before the stand at Lake Quinsigamond. To those on the press boat who had been accustomed to watch the beginning of the race each year on a steamer that usually lies over on the east shore, and at least a quarter of a mile away from the eights, which have always started from skiffs anchored close up to the west bank, it was a novel and exhilarating experience to be able to look down into the shells and mark the play of well-developed muscles, and to note the very expressions on the faces of the sixteen men as they got in readiness at the referee's command.

An adverse wind, blowing directly up the course and "freshening" the water to a condition unfit for racing craft, caused a half day's postponement from the morning hour originally named for the race. "The usual postponement," it used to be called in the old Saratoga days, but spectators accustomed to the prompter and more efficient management that has hitherto characterized the New London era of college rowing, found it an unexpected and vexatious annoyance. As the rules expressly provide that the race shall be rowed with the ebb tide, there was nothing for Mr. Rives to do but to put the race over for twenty-four hours, if either side had so insisted. He very wisely suggested, however, to the two captains that they might by mutual consent waive the strict letter of the rule, and by starting at the finish line and pulling up the river, row the race to-day and still get the benefit of the tide. The suggestion was at once agreed to, and the start was made off the grand stand at Winthrop's Point, near the city, within half an hour of the time set.

Harvard was the first to appear, getting into the shell from their launch a few minutes after six. As they paddled down to the post they looked as strong and well set up as the best crews which either college has sent to New London. With perhaps a single exception, every man in the boat was full-chested and thick-set; but twenty strokes was enough to convince any experienced observer that their stroke was radically defective. Even in their preliminary paddle it was plain to see that the long, swinging action which has marked the style of all Harvard eights for the last nine years had been lost. The Yale eight, on the other hand, though certainly the inferiors of their opponents in muscular development and seasoned strength, had been taught to row a much more effective stroke. Their body swing was perfection, and they got into the water together with just enough of a "catch" for impetus and not enough to reduce the "heave" that has marred the style of so many Yale crews in years gone by, and sent the nose of their shell bobbing up and down. It seemed as though the Harvard men, in their anxiety to avoid this very defect, had gone so far to the other extreme that they failed to do any effective work with the oar until the stroke had been pulled half through. It was said a year ago that the Harvard crew had been coached to mind their "time in the water," and to let their "time in the boat" take care of itself. While in 1885 their oarsmanship in the latter particular was open to criticism, in the former they were above reproach, and their "watersmanship" generally was something marvellous. To-day the unevenness of their body swing had become so great that it affected their work in the water, and their oars failed to get in with anything like their precise and delicate manipulation of a year ago.

Mr. Rives had much trouble in getting the crews into line. Owing to culpably bad management, no starting skiffs had been anchored off the

flag, so that the eights had to be "lined up" in the old-fashioned way, alternately backing and filling at the order of the referee. The word was given at 6:29, the crews caught the water simultaneously, and the race began. Harvard started at a much faster pace than any of the newspapers have credited her with. Her stroke, accurately timed, was nearly 40 to the minute. That is to say, the first 39 strokes were pulled and the crew were swinging forward on the 40th just as the second-hand touched the dot. Yale went off at 36, and although Harvard's sharp burst for the lead probably succeeded in securing for her a slight advantage (at least so it appeared from the press boat, which lagged uncomfortably far astern), it was only temporary, for, before a hundred strokes had been pulled, Yale's nose began to show in front, and at the half mile the lead was undoubtedly with her never to be lost again. At this point both eights were rowing at 37, for although Mr. Penrose, the Harvard stroke, had dropped his pace, the crew, owing to their short and "snatchy" actions in the water, appeared still to be "hitting her up" at three or four strokes per minute more than Yale; and they seemed to labor at an ineffective spurt, while their opponents, swinging evenly, catching together and pulling their stroke clean through, pushed gradually but surely ahead. The mile flag was passed with Yale leading by from three to five seconds. Both crews were pulling at 36.

There was no official time accurately taken except at the start and finish, and the guess-work from the press boat, a quarter of a mile astern of the shells, is utterly unreliable. At the mile-and-a-half flag, the distance between the boats had widened by at least another length, and the difference in styles of rowing became more and more emphasized as the race proceeded. At this point Yale rowed at 35, Harvard still pulling at 36. For the next mile there was little change in the relative positions of the two shells, the strokes setting the same pace as before, until the 2½-mile flag, when Harvard dropped to 35, Yale leading by three or four lengths of clear water. As they cleared the flag, Penrose began to quicken and sent his pace up to 38. The whole crew responded vigorously, and, rowing in as good form as at any time during the race, they seemed to draw up on the leaders, hand over hand. But the spurt was short, and though dashing and plucky it did not suffice to cut down the lead. At the 3-mile flag Yale increased her pace to 36, with Harvard still dashing away at 38, and it seemed from the press boat (which the management had very carelessly allowed to become overcrowded with spectators, not representatives of the press, so that it fell hopelessly behind) as though the two crews were on even terms. Mr. Caldwell, the Yale stroke, rowed, however, with excellent judgment at this point, and did not allow himself to become at all flurried by Harvard's spurt. He waited until they had come within two lengths or so of his rudder, and then, just as the Harvard spurt began to die away, he added a single stroke to his pace, and drew easily ahead, this time taking a commanding lead, which he maintained without difficulty to the finish. Both crews began the last half-mile at 35, and both spurted splendidly on the last quarter, Yale running up to 38. A tug in the line of vision prevented the spectators on the press boat from catching Harvard's rate, though it was plain to see that she was spurring, too. Both eights went down the home stretch at a rattling pace, Harvard pulling with a snap and good form seldom seen in a beaten crew, while Yale flew over the line the winner by seven or eight lengths in the very fast time of 20 minutes, 41¼ seconds. Harvard was 24½ seconds slower.

The race was pulled with great spirit, and although the better crew led practically from the start, it was an eventful and exciting struggle. Mr. Cook deserves great credit for his masterly work in licking into shape a raw crew, who a month ago were certainly much behind their Cambridge rivals. Harvard's defective stroke made victory impossible, in spite of her apparently superior material. She will have to go back, as Yale's bitter experience has already forced her to do, to the successful teachings of the past, retaining certain undoubted advantages gained from her work with Faulkner under Capt. Storrow. Her crew did not row a "professional" stroke, as many have foolishly and rashly declared simply because they failed to win, but they emphasized one or two defects of last year. G. W. G.

THE TWO PARLIAMENTS OF 1886.

LONDON, June 26.

It will be necessary to speak in the plural of the Parliaments of 1886. There has been a spring Parliament, and there will be an autumn or winter Parliament. The first, dissolved to-day, has been a Parliament of one session. The second, it is probable, will have the same character. If so, the Parliamentary year will be, if I may venture to say so, without going very minutely into the remote antiquities of the subject, or to the dark ages of the Constitution, unique in English history. There have been only two Parliaments during the past hundred years which approach it in the brevity of their duration. The Parliament of 1806 lasted four months and a half. The Parliament of 1830 lasted nearly six months. That which has come to a close to-day, though summoned for the 12th of January, was not organized for business until the 21st, when the Queen's speech was delivered. It has therefore had a working, or rather a talking, existence of rather more than five months. The precedents, however, of shortness of life are not really to the point. In 1806 the Granville Administration was dismissed by the King because it had brought forward certain measures for the relief of the Roman Catholics. Though the Portland Ministry, which succeeded it, had the support of the House of Commons, a dissolution took place in order that the country might be consulted as to the action of the King in changing his advisers. "You have taught me," George II. said once to the elder Pitt, "to look elsewhere than in the House of Commons, to the sense of my people." It was not through any prudence of constitutionalism that George III. took this course. He knew that the "No-Popery" feeling was as strong in the country as it was in his own mind, and with the sagacity which he not unfrequently displayed, he desired to strengthen himself against future attempts to force the Catholic question upon him by a decisive popular vote. The appeal was successful.

The one-session Parliament of 1806 does not therefore afford any analogy on the grounds of its dissolution to that of 1886. The House of Commons was not at variance with the Ministry; but the King desired to obtain the sanction of the electoral body to a personal act of his own, scarcely in harmony with the theory of the Constitution, even as it was at that day interpreted. The instance of 1830 is more nearly to the point. Lord Grey's Ministry had been defeated in Committee on the Reform Bill. The King then, as the Queen now, had accepted the advice of the Ministers to submit the question at issue to the sense of the country. In one important particular the analogy fails. The cry with which Lord Grey and his colleagues went before the constitu-

encies was "The bill, the whole bill, and nothing but the bill." They did not say, "The principle of reform alone is at stake. The bill is dead. You have nothing to do with its details." This is what Mr. Gladstone says with respect to the Government of Ireland Bill, although some of his colleagues contradict him. This uncertainty confuses the issue. An ostensible majority may be returned, which will be in favor of the principle that affairs exclusively Irish shall be referred to an Irish Parliament, but which will yet withhold its assent to the particular scheme which may be submitted to it when Parliament meets. When Capt. Cuttle affirmed a general principle, he was in the habit of adding: "The bearing of this remark lies in the application of it." There was a good deal of the wisdom of Burke in Capt. Cuttle's philosophy. Mr. Gladstone is ready enough to say what he intends to do, but he declines to say how he intends to do it. The result may be a majority for the principle, but a minority for the measure; another short Parliament, and a dissolution before the year is over.

The late Parliament scarcely lived long enough to develop or display a character of its own. The Speaker, who to-day ceases to be the first commoner in England, and becomes simply Mr. Arthur Peel of Sandy Lodge, Bedfordshire, is understood to have formed and expressed a very favorable opinion of it. But the Speaker's view is rather that which a headmaster would take of a school of not very brilliant, but steady, orderly, and well-conducted boys, than of a political observer. The new members were not mutineers. Many of them were necessarily unacquainted with the rules of Parliament, and the inexperience and want of authority of the chief Ministerial whip were sources of embarrassment. Ludicrous anecdotes are told of mistakes and blunders which would have made the hair stand upon the heads of the late Col. Taylor and the late Sir William Hayter. But the bitches arising from these causes were slight, and did not counterbalance the immense gain to Parliamentary order and decorum obtained through the novel good behavior of the Irish members. Whether this good behavior will be apparent in the next Parliament depends of course upon contingencies as yet undetermined. If a ministry remains in existence, and a policy is persisted in which will give them what they want, the Irish members will be models of social and Parliamentary deportment. If not, they are likely enough to outdo their exploits in previous years. With a view to this possibility, the reflection of the late Speaker is a matter scarcely of choice in the House of Commons. Members whose experience in the House of Commons extends over half a century, going back to the first reformed Parliament, speak of Mr. Peel as decidedly the ablest occupant of the chair within their knowledge. With the high-bred courtesy of his immediate predecessor, the present Viscount Hampden, he associates perhaps somewhat greater quickness of perception and authority in decision with a firmness of character which will not be trifled with, an impartiality which even Irish members do not dispute. He is an instance of a man of great and in some respects unique powers, finding, at a time of life when the career of others is drawing to a close, the one thing which he can do better, perhaps, than any one else. He has waited and his fate has come to him.

Within a fortnight the character of the new Parliament will be determined. The borough elections will be over by about the 5th or 6th of July, the counties by the 10th or 12th.

The absurd arrangement by which the elections are dispersed over a fortnight not only protracts a period of excitement and tumult, but often falsifies in part the independent judgment of the country. The accidental result of the first day's polling sways a good many weak-minded and impressionable people to the side of the party which has a purely casual majority on that day. If the elections were taken simultaneously all over the country, this improper bias would be avoided, a fortnight's tumult would be compressed within twenty-four hours, and the disingenuous tactics of party managers setting their sails to the veering wind of opinion would be impossible. The only objection to this course is that persons possessing qualifications in different and distant constituencies might be unable to vote in more than one or two of them. But those who hold that the "one man, one vote" principle is the sound one, would approve this accidental corrective of a vicious system of plural voting.

An interval of thirty-five days must elapse between the dissolution of one Parliament and the assembling of another. A day is named in the writ of summons, and usually an early day, so that in case of emergency the two houses may be assembled. But if there is no special reason for bringing them together, the time of their actual meeting is by successive prorogations adjourned to the time now consecrated by usage, that is to say, until the first week of February. Mr. Gladstone has, however, promised that in the event of the elections not being on the face of them decisive one way or the other, Parliament shall be called together at the earliest practicable date, that is to say, in the present instance, on the first day or in the first week of August. If the returns show a clear majority against the Government, it may be taken for granted that he will follow the precedent created by Mr. Disraeli in 1868, followed by himself in 1874, and confirmed by Lord Beaconsfield in 1880. That is to say, he will resign office, so as to allow of a new Ministry being formed, which will fix such a date as may seem convenient for the meeting of Parliament—a date which will give it time to consider its policy and prepare its measures. This procedure was a revolutionary innovation when Mr. Disraeli introduced it, but may now be considered a constitutional usage. The old theory was that no member of the House of Commons was pledged to anything but to the exercise of his independent and unbiassed judgment on the proposals which might be submitted to the House by the Government; that the opinion of the constituencies could only be pronounced through a formal vote of their representatives. Now it is recognized that the electorate itself directly gives judgment, and that that judgment must be promptly obeyed by the Ministry; that is to say, that the Parliamentary sovereignty resides not in the Queen, the Lords, and the Commons in Parliament assembled, but, on a dissolution, in the Queen, the Lords, and the Commons, who, as an electoral body, have chosen representatives instructed to support a particular minister and policy. If there is a conclusive majority on behalf of the Government, probably the meeting of Parliament will be postponed to such a date as will allow the present ministers time to prepare their measures. Only in the case of parties being nearly equally balanced will Parliament be summoned at once to strike the balance between them. This third possibility is more likely than either of the two others. Of course, it will be for Mr. Gladstone to decide what he will regard as a popular vote in his favor. We may assume that the vote of Ireland will be substantially what it was at the last general elec-

tion. The Irish vote in favor of home rule, strengthened by a large minority of the members for Great Britain, might possibly give a majority of the whole Parliament. But, if the practical unanimity of the Irish representatives in favor of home rule was the condition precedent of proposing such a measure, a decisive majority in its favor of the representatives of Great Britain is a condition not less essential. To persist in it against the recorded opinion of the greater and more important island would be a scandalous indecency. If a measure only so supported came to the House of Lords, that house would be abundantly justified, by constitutional usage and moral propriety, in rejecting it. If the virtual unanimity of Ireland is necessary, the virtual unanimity of Great Britain is not less necessary, to a revision of the constitutional relations between the two countries. What the result will be depends on forces the existence of which is known, but the relative intensity of which it is impossible to estimate beforehand. Pretended prediction can only be a lucky or unlucky guess. K.

Correspondence.

THE TOMBS OF MYCENÆ.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your well-known correspondent, Mr. W. J. Stillman, in No. 1090 of the *Nation*, urges with renewed vigor his familiar arguments against the claim of high antiquity usually made for the tombs discovered by Dr. Schliemann at Mycenæ. Having recently revisited both Mycenæ and Tiryns, he is strongly confirmed in his theory, that the so-called "Royal Tombs" are no sepulchres of Achaean princes or of "heroes before Agamemnon," but Celtic graves of the third century B. C., "of the period of the barbarian invasions stimulated by Pyrrhus." The "palace of Tiryns" is assigned without hesitation to the Byzantine period—"it may be as late even as the tenth or eleventh century A. D." The same arguments and conclusions appear in a letter recently addressed to the *London Times* by its Athens correspondent, and an elaborate reply to these, written by Dr. Dörpfeld, appears in the *Times* of May 29.

I am the last person who would presume to dispute the age of a stone wall with your correspondent, provided the facts were beyond question. But my visit to Mycenæ in 1883 convinced me that the walls which now line the tombs discovered by Dr. Schliemann, and the wall enclosing the so-called agora in which the tombs were dug, are in a condition which makes them a very unsafe basis for determining the age of the tombs. Before going to Mycenæ I had been much puzzled by the reports brought by travelers who visited the famous tombs, all agreeing that the walls which lined them were entirely different from those which Schliemann had described in 'Mycenæ' and had drawn with such exact measurements in the vertical sections of his plan B B. On looking into the tombs themselves I was still more puzzled by the modern character of the walls which lined them, and all idea of referring such walls to the heroic age was at an end. I was also struck by the barbaric character of much of the elliptical wall which supports the agora within which the tombs were excavated. The whole mystery was, however, solved, at least to my own satisfaction, when the Greek who was showing me the tombs informed me that, after Dr. Schliemann had left Mycenæ, every stone had been removed from these tombs in the hope of

finding more gold and silver, and that the walls had all been replaced *under his own direction*. He stated, also, that the sustaining wall of the agora, a stone wall about fourteen feet high, below which there is a narrow passage open to travellers, was thought to be in danger of falling and had been pulled down and rebuilt in many places. He at first declared that everything had been replaced "exactly as it was found"; but when I showed him split stones with fresh surfaces built into the walls, he admitted that he had sometimes found it necessary to "split the larger stones" so as to handle them. From what this man told me of the careless way in which he and other "Greeks of a late period" had been allowed to repair and rebuild the walls I have mentioned, I felt satisfied that the only walls which could properly be used as testimony concerning the age of the tombs have been so changed by irresponsible workmen as to be utterly worthless as evidence of anything. No one who compares the vertical section of the first tomb in plan B B of 'Mycenæ' with its exact measurements, giving a length of only five and a half feet for the space in which the fossil man now in Charvati was found, with the present tomb, which gives a clear length of seven feet in the same place, can explain this difference on any theory of careless measurements or careless statements on the part of Dr. Schliemann. What we now see and what he described cannot possibly be identical.

Although the testimony I have given may not satisfy everybody, and some may think that I was deceived by an artful Greek, I am perfectly satisfied for myself that all the present walls of the tombs of Mycenæ, and many important parts of the enclosing wall, do not date from the heroic age or even from the age of Pyrrhus, but from the year 1879 A. D.

W. W. GOODWIN.

CAMBRIDGE, June 14, 1886.

THE CONSPIRACY AGAINST CHEAP BUTTER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In Boston, by a combination of municipal appropriation and private benevolence, cooking-schools have been established in which girls attending the public schools, many of them from families of very limited means, are not only taught the art of cookery practically, but are told about the composition and nutritive values of foods, and how to select as well as use them most economically. The teachers are not merely ladies of large general intelligence and skill in household affairs, but have had especial training in the scientific principles that underlie the right exercise of the art they teach. One of these schools is in North Bennett Street, a quarter inhabited by the poorer people of the city. Miss Palmer, the teacher in this school, in referring to the efforts made to instil right ideas of economy, says:

"I do not find much difficulty in getting my girls to see that inexpensive foods are really wholesome, nutritious, and good. The children are much interested in learning the price of oleomargarine (the best is fourteen cents a pound here now) as compared with that of butter. No butter has been used at the North Bennett St. Cooking School during the past year, and, had it not been for oleomargarine, I should have rejected, on the ground of extravagance, dishes which we were thereby enabled to cook. The children buy the food they prepare, if they so desire, at the cost of the materials, and it has been my object to keep the price of even the most attractive articles so low that even the poorest girls might take them home and reproduce them there. I visited a poor family yesterday [who have lately become comparatively prosperous], and asked about the butter they used, and learned that they allowed themselves for cooking and table use for five persons but a pound a week at twenty-eight cents per pound,

which is the lowest price, even at this season [June], at which butter is palatable. How much better it will be for her [the mother] to use oleomargarine at fourteen cents in the future! When the directors of the School held their meetings there they wanted a noon lunch. I had no butter to give them, so they ate oleomargarine on their bread much more cheerfully than they would have eaten poor butter."

Miss Palmer cites other instances of the use of oleomargarine in places where oleomargarine is used with greatest satisfaction among well-to-do people, and considers its general use, especially for cooking, very advisable.

While the Oleomargarine Bill, which, instead of providing for regulation of the manufacture and sale of imitation butter in such ways as to prevent use of unwholesome materials, and to insure its sale on its merits, proposed to tax it so high as to bring the price up to that of butter, and render the manufacture and sale unprofitable, was pending in the House of Representatives at Washington, the *Connecticut Farmer* called upon its readers to keep close watch upon their representatives in Congress, and by their future votes to "strike down any man, be he Republican or Democrat," who should not vote for the bill. Three Connecticut representatives supported the measure, and received the warm approval of that journal. The single one who opposed it received a full measure of the threatened opprobrium.

Now notice the contrast. Science has shown how an excellent food product may be brought within the reach of that large mass of people of limited means who make up the bulk of our population—a product to whose nutritive value specialists bear unanimous testimony, and with whose flavor even the critical are content. In the exercise of an especially useful charity, a school, supported by public and private benevolence, teaches daughters of families in moderate circumstances and of the worthy poor in Massachusetts how to work towards elevation of their home life, by more refined and judicious economy in selection and use of food the cost of which makes more than half of their whole living expenses. With other things, this food product is wisely commended. But another class of the people, the dairymen, regarding this food product as interfering with their own profits, ask, not that its improper manufacture and sale, of which they justly complain, shall be regulated in accordance with the principles of legislation that justice and experience have approved, but that it shall be subjected to a tax which will not only put its price beyond the poor man's reach, but, if practicable, stop its manufacture. Is this the fairness and the wisdom which the American people will approve?

W. O. ATWATER.

CHEMICAL LABORATORY, WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY,
MIDDLETOWN, CONN., July 2, 1886.

SECOND-HAND ERUDITION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I have before me No. 54 of the *English Classic Series*, published by Clark & Maynard, New York, 'American Taxation, a Speech delivered April 19, 1774, by Edmund Burke. Edited, with notes, by Albert F. Blaisdell, A.M.' At first glance it seems that Mr. Blaisdell has done his work thoroughly and well. Besides a life of Burke, a number of quotations from leading writers in regard to Burke, and a paragraph on "Burke as a Master of English Style," the reader is given an introductory note to the speech and a number of valuable explanatory and illustrative notes. Quotations are introduced from or references made to Locke, Adam Smith, Bentham, Bancroft, Erskine, Walpole, Sherlock, Macaulay, Johnson, Hazlitt, Lucan, Goldsmith, Pope, Milton, and Shakspeare; and Mr. Blaisdell is made

to seem a very well-read man, thoroughly fitted for his task.

To seem, for in reality all this erudition is second-hand, and Mr. Blaisdell is "a man of one book." That book is 'Burke's Select Works, Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by E. J. Payne, M.A. Vol. i,' one of the admirable Clarendon Press Series. The introductory paragraph on "Burke as a Master of English Style," in Mr. Blaisdell's edition, a large part of the introductory note to the speech, every explanatory note, illustration, quotation, reference, or allusion—except two—all are taken from Mr. Payne's edition, the exact wording being retained save in a very few instances. Occasionally we are treated to such a patchwork as the following:

Burke as a Master of English Style.

The writings of Burke are the daily bread of statesmen, orators, and political writers. We cannot study the speeches of any successful modern orator without observing how much he owes to the method, the phraseology, the images, and even the quotations of Burke. Shakespeare above all things refines the taste; Milton quickens and exalts the imagination. The peculiar effect of Burke is to enlarge, strengthen, liberalize, and ennoble the understanding. No writer, not even Macaulay, excels him in producing an effect by interspersions of short, pointed, and forcible sentences, so necessary to an energetic and suggestive style. Burke gave a lasting stimulus to English prose literature by the introduction of a fresher and more natural diction. His writings have ever since been the model of all who wished to say anything forcibly, naturally, freely, and in a comparatively small space. The young student of Burke will find it necessary to exert an unusual degree of patience, and to acquire the habit of continually suspending his own judgment. He will find himself in contact with much that seems dry and uninviting. It may therefore be well to caution him at the outset that Burke, like all writers of the first class, will not repay a superficial perusal. He gains upon us, not altogether by the inherent interest of what he presents to us, but very much by the will and force with which he presents it; and these qualities do not immediately strike the mental eye in all their fulness.

From Payne's Introduction to Vol. I.

But while the speeches of Sheridan are read once and then laid on the shelf, the writings of Burke are the daily bread of statesmen, speakers, and political writers. We cannot peruse the speeches of any successful modern orator without observing how much they owe to the method, the phraseology, the images, and even the quotations of Burke. (3.) Shakspeare, above all things, refines the taste; Milton quickens and exalts the imagination. The peculiar effect of Burke is to enlarge, strengthen, liberalize, and ennoble the understanding (37). Nor does any writer, not even Macaulay, excel him in producing effect by that less methodical interspersions of short, pointed, and forcible sentences throughout the performance, which is so necessary to the energetic and suggestive style (41). In this way Burke gave a lasting stimulus to English prose literature, as Wordsworth soon afterwards gave a stimulus to poetry by the introduction of a fresher and more natural diction. His writings have ever since been the model of all who wish to say anything forcibly, naturally, freely, and in a comparatively small space (54). He the student will find it necessary to exert an unusual degree of patience, and to acquire the habit of continually suspending his own judgment. He will find himself in contact with much that seems dry and uninviting. It may therefore be well to caution him at the outset that Burke, like all writers of the first class, will not repay a prejudiced or a superficial perusal. He gains upon us, not altogether by the inherent interest of what he presents to us, but very much by the skill and force with which he presents it; and these qualities do not immediately strike the mental eye in all their fulness (5).

Sundry verbal changes in the above extract—obviously errors—must have been noted; but the conclusion of the second note, page 8, proves that even as a plagiarist and literary hack Mr. Blaisdell is a bungler: "The student should observe the contrast between this preamble and that of the speech which follows. The latter is full of touches of that trifling which was so common in the speaking of the last century—what Hazlitt terms 'calling out the speaker to dance a minuet with him before he begins.'" In Payne's edition, as the speech on conciliation with America follows that on American taxation, this note was quite appropriate; but in Blaisdell's "edition," as no speech follows, it is only ridiculous, and serves to point out the source of Mr. Blaisdell's inspiration.

One further point is worthy of note. Mr. Payne gives on page 290 of his volume a quotation from Prof. Goldwin Smith, enclosing the extract in the proper marks and giving due credit to the author. Mr. Blaisdell, on page 22 of his pamphlet, steals the quotation from Mr. Payne, omits the quotation marks, and neglects to credit the extract to

its author. Is Mr. Blaisdell a victim of "literary kleptomania"?

What makes the matter more serious than if Mr. Blaisdell had simply stolen another man's poem and signed his name to it, or "conveyed" a little story from the French or German, is that this pamphlet is intended for school use. One of the evils that a teacher has often to encounter is the propensity of idle students, or of students working only for credits or rewards, to plagiarize, and often heroic remedies must be used to cure the evil. How must anything the teacher can say lose weight, if the student finds that the "editor" of the very book he is studying not only does not lose caste, but even wins reputation and money by the very practices condemned; for surely plagiarism is not a labor of love with Mr. Blaisdell?

Just what punishment should be inflicted on one guilty of such practices, it is difficult to say. For analogous practices an attorney would be disbarred, an officer in the army or navy degraded or cashiered. Surely the morale of the teachers and scholars in this country is as high as that of these professions. Mr. Blaisdell affixes A.M. to his name; does not a way for our colleges to make the degrees mean something suggest itself?

WM. DALLAM ARMES.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY, CAL.

NATURAL GAS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In this time of discussing taxation and protecting industries, there is one commodity that seems to be a natural subject of special taxation—natural gas. The scope and promise of this new factor in industry is such as portends no little disturbance to our iron and other industries, and there seems no good reason why the nation should not share in the benefit of this great boon, although its discovery and source be in a special district of the country.

Natural gas, as its name indicates, is not a product of skill, is not even a surface product such as is conveyed in Government titles to land. It comes from "the bowels of the earth," and one who regards its present vast influence and conjectures its future, must concede that it will throw our industries out of balance. If ever there was a suitable and equitable subject for special taxation, is not here one? The menace to the dairy sinks into insignificance in comparison with the danger to our manufacturing industries from this new and miraculous fuel. It is not too much to claim, on the score of cost alone, to say nothing of other advantages, that the cheapening of many manufactures in Pittsburgh amounts to ten per cent. How is fair competition to be maintained without a tax?

"PROTECTION."

PITTSBURGH, June 22, 1886.

PRAISE FROM A WAGE-WORKER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Enclosed you will find Post-office order for three dollars, renewing my annual subscription to your admirable paper. I am, and always have been, a wage-worker, and as such necessarily take a deep interest in all questions and agitations having for their avowed object the improvement and amelioration of my class. In none of the current newspaper literature of to-day in this republic do I find such healthy, vigorous articles upon labor and cognate topics as in the columns of the *Nation*. If the more thoughtful and intelligent of my class could be induced to take a course of the *Nation* for the next twelve months, and compare its utterances with the sophistry and mendacity of the *New York Sun* or *John Swinton's Paper*, it could not fail to neu-

tralize the pestilent mischief which those advocates of demagoguery, buncombe, and rascality are rapidly instilling into the minds of the working classes.

It is hardly possible that a paper which appeals solely to a cultivated intelligence and high ethical principle can become popular with the masses. Their sentiments and prejudices are in the main stronger than their principles, and the policeman is a more effective restraint upon their appetites than the love of God or the fear of hell. There is, however, thank God, a rapidly increasing number of our fellow-citizens who are acting upon the principle that the claims of the country are paramount to those of party, and that fealty to the Constitution and the laws is of more importance than partisan political success. That their numbers may grow, and the *Nation*, as their leader and organ, fulfil an honorable position in aiding the development of a higher, truer, and purer civilization in this great republic, along the lines of equity, justice, and morality, is the sincere wish of

Yours respectfully, JAS. RYAN.

CRESTON, IOWA, June 26, 1886.

PLEASEING EVERYBODY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Having been on your subscription list for some time, I have (really) been purposing to write you a brief but *emphatic* censure of your wrong position and your failure to see the underlying ideas of the *Irish question*, which furnish such a contrast to your *clearly* right position on our labor troubles.

J. M.

CHELSEA, MASS., July 5, 1886.

HOME RULE AS A SETTLEMENT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In discussions on the Irish question, is not one point too much left out?

Since 1846, when I was a regular contributor to the *Irish Nation*, I have been always an advocate of justice to Ireland. I take home rule to be a part of that, and I am still, as I have ever been, anxious for a settlement of the quarrel between Ireland and Great Britain. I am told that the Parnell Parliamentarians, speaking in the name of the Irish people, would accept Mr. Gladstone's measure as a final settlement, not merely as means for enforcing more. May it be pertinent to ask whether the American Irish (or Irish-Americans, whichever is the correct term) and the Fenians and the "Invincibles" would in good faith accept the same? If not, how are they to be dealt with? Will some Irish friend make answer?

W. J. LINTON.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., July 4, 1886.

DR. WALDSTEIN AND THE METOPE OF THE PARTHENON.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In answer to Mr. Waldstein's letter published in the *Nation* of June 10, I wish to state that the sole object of my note in the *Nation* of April 29 was to put your readers on their guard against the conclusions they might have drawn from the facts as stated in your review of Mr. Waldstein's book. Mr. Waldstein was not aware of the discussion which had occurred in the *Société des Antiquaires*: his good faith and honesty are indeed quite out of the question. But the existence of the *Revue des Revues*, which brings every year to the notice of the public analyses of all periodicals and proceedings of societies, gave me the right to regret that Mr. Waldstein had ignored a discussion relating to the favorite object of his studies. Bibliographical accuracy and

completeness, which were almost unattainable ten years ago, are now made so easy by the exertions of some periodicals, that an author is no longer allowed, in my opinion, to miss any late authority concerning the work he is engaged in.

As for the genuineness of the Louvre terracotta and Mr. Waldstein's note F, I can only refer to a recent article which I contributed to the *Revue Critique*, where I expressed my regret that Mr. Waldstein had not entirely rewritten his essay, which, as it now stands, may prove very misleading to many scholars.

Truly yours,

SALOMON REINACH.

MUSÉE GALLO-ROMAIN DE ST.-GERMAIN (SEINE-ET-OISE).

Notes.

H. V. & H. W. POOR have just issued a useful 'Directory of Railway Officials,' giving in a more comprehensive manner a great deal of information for which the public has been accustomed to seek in the 'Manual of Railroads,' annually issued by the same publishers. Poor's 'Manual' was intended to give a statement of the extent and condition of the railroads, rather than the names and addresses of the managers. By putting the latter in a separate volume they have been able to make their lists fuller and better. The 'Directory' contains upwards of 30,000 names and addresses, including railroad officers and directors in the United States and Canada; contractors, bridge-builders, and dealers in equipment or supplies, horse-railroad officials, railroad commissioners; clearing-houses, transportation companies, and various associations of railroads or railroad employees, with their officers. Some information, though far less complete, is given with regard to Central and South American railroads, and even those of Great Britain and Ireland. The whole forms a volume of about 400 pages, not quite half of which are occupied by advertisements. The substance is remarkably good; the arrangement is not as good as it might be. The order of the tables is a haphazard one; even the index of names is not placed at the end, but a hundred pages earlier. We hope that this defect will be remedied in subsequent editions.

The more than welcome announcement is made that the third and concluding part of Tolstoi's 'War and Peace' will be published (in the Clara Bell version) in this city on July 9—by Wm. S. Gottsberger in his series, and doubtless simultaneously in the Franklin Square Library.

The second volume of Morley's 'Miscellanies,' in the uniform edition of Macmillan & Co., is wholly occupied with French biographical studies—of Vauvenargues, Turgot, Condorcet, and Joseph de Maistre.

Charles Scribner's Sons publish directly a novel by Robert Louis Stevenson, entitled, 'Kidnapped; Being Memoirs of the Adventures of David Balfour in the Year 1751: How he was Kidnapped and Cast Away; his Sufferings in a Desert Isle: his Journey in the Wild Highlands; his acquaintance with Alan Breck Stewart and other notorious Highland Jacobites; with all that he suffered at the hands of his Uncle, Ebenezer Balfour of Shaws, falsely so called'; and 'Carlsbad and its Environs,' by John Merryless, who discusses the value of the place as a health resort. In August they will publish, in connection with Chatto & Windus, 'A Secret of the Sea,' and other collected stories by Brander Matthews. They promise for delivery in the autumn the second volume of J. D. Champlin, jr.'s 'Cyclopædia of Painters and Paintings.' In the July number of their *Bookbuyer* they give a specially engraved portrait of Dr. Schliemann.

We learn that the demand for Mrs. Dall's pamphlet on "Sordello" has quite exhausted the edi-

tion, and copies are obtainable with difficulty, if at all. The publishers have none. Another and larger edition might be issued if the present call in excess of the supply should continue.

Mr. Charles E. Merrill, who retired on July 1 from the publishing firm of Taintor Bros., Merrill & Co., has purchased their interest in the *Critic*, and will devote himself for some time to promoting its interests; Miss Gilder and her brother still retaining editorial charge and a proprietary interest.

The latest of Mr. David Douglas's beautifully printed little volumes by American authors is Mr. William Winter's 'Shakspeare's England,' a revision in one volume of the American books called 'The Trip to England' and 'English Rambles.' This most excellent series, issued by honorable arrangement with the authors, now extends to more than two-score volumes, including sixteen by Mr. Howells, six by Dr. Holmes, six by Mr. Burroughs, and five by Mr. Aldrich.

Mrs. Lamb gives many interesting particulars concerning the laying out of Lafayette Place in this city, in her *Magazine of American History* for July. She gossips also about the builders and occupants of many of the more important houses on this beautiful street, which in a single generation lost its fashionable attractiveness, and began to be given over to business purposes. The Astor and Mercantile Libraries and some large printing establishments and publishing houses at present give the neighborhood a literary stamp which it might well retain for many years.

A convenient conspectus of the part taken by the alumni of our American colleges in their management is given in the *Madisonensis* for June 16, by Mr. Edward M. Grout of this city.

Mr. H. D. Traill, in the *May Macmillan*, quoting Mr. Lowell's remark that books formerly were regarded, "like umbrellas, as *ferce nature*," adds—"a *mot* to which I have no other objection to take than that in its form it is calculated to confirm the popular error that *ferce* [videlicet, in this locution] is a nominative plural instead of a genitive singular." It is curious that the *Lounger* of the *Critic* wishes to remind "Mr. Traill that, granting he is right, he is criticising an error in a report of which Mr. Lowell presumably did not see a proof."

One might expect a wide demand for Circular No. 5 of the Bureau of Education in the series of 1885, just published. It is an exhibit of the systems of physical training in American colleges and universities, by Dr. Edward Mussey Hartwell, of Johns Hopkins, and is illustrated with plans and elevations of the more important collegiate gymnasiums.

The programme of the eighth year of the Harvard Annex for women is now issued and procurable at 5 Waterhouse Street, Cambridge, of Mr. Arthur Gilman, Secretary of the Society for the Collegiate Instruction of Women.

From L. W. Schmidt, 7 Barclay St., we have the concluding parts (56-60) of the lesser 'Brockhaus' Conversations-Lexikon.' This work, bound, makes two volumes. Its chief recommendation, apart from its freshness in selection and revision, is its extreme condensation. An article a column long is a rarity, though such and longer occur. As a handy reference for essential facts, this compendium will find a place where larger and more costly dictionaries are out of the question. Indeed, perhaps it is as desirable for persons whose culture is not regulated by the cyclopædia as for the opposite class. The plates are excellent, and numerous enough.

Russia and Saxony are the leading articles in Parts 196-201 of the larger Brockhaus (13th ed.), which now advances as far as *Schleifen*.

Le Livre for June offers a diversion from reviews of current literature in M. Adolphe Racot's instructive analysis of three historical romances

by Alexandre Dumas fils—'Tristan le Roux,' 'Henri de Navarre,' and 'Les Deux Frondes,' 1849-51. In the "Gazette Bibliographique" we read of Marshal MacMahon writing his memoirs, not for publication, but for his own family; also, of a projected library of the first French Revolution to be gathered for the Exposition of 1889 (a hundred years after '89), and made the nucleus of a permanent Museum and Library of the Revolution. The full text of the new Belgian copyright act of March 22, 1886, is given on pp. 321-324.

In *Polybiblion* for May there is a notice of a pamphlet, 'Le Chant de la Marseillaise,' by M. Arthur Loth, in which the author is said to prove that the tune of the Marseillaise hymn is merely the reproduction, note by note, of a page of an oratorio entitled 'Esther,' by a certain Grisons, formerly *maitre de chapelle* at the cathedral of Saint-Omer. Of course, the writer in *Polybiblion*, which is in every sense hostile to the French Revolution and to anything emanating from it, rejoices at the discovery—at the "ungilding of another Revolutionary glory."

The *Journal des Débats* is publishing in its *feuilleton* 'Souvenirs de la maison des morts,' translated from the Russian of Dostoyevsky.

The Chinese general Tchong-Ki-Tong, who is now at the head of the diplomatic service of his country in France, and whose success in Paris, both as a man of the world and as a writer, has been great, has won new honors as a *conférencier*. The *Journal des Débats* of June 13 gives an account of the address delivered by him the previous evening at the Cercle Saint-Simon upon "Les Lettrés en Chine," which, in addition to the solid facts that it gave, must have sparked all over with the peculiar grave and ironical wit of the learned Oriental who has absorbed the *esprit* of his Parisian associates. When this lecture appears in his next volume, it will be well worth reading, not only for the contrasts between the two dissimilar civilizations which he presents, but for the ease with which he throws a shade of mockery over all he says, so delicate and light that it is impossible to determine just where he intends it to rest. It seems to be one of the most amusing and telling things he has yet done.

Hetzel has just published one of Turgeneff's works which has not before been translated into French, 'Un Bulgare.'

Calmann Lévy has just published the first volume of a work by the Duc de Noailles, 'Cent ans de république aux États-Unis' (New York: Christern).

The poetic works of Shelley, hitherto very little known in France, have been for the first time completely translated into French by M. F. Rabbe. The first volume is announced (Paris: E. Giraud & Cie.).

As an example of enterprise, the conductors of our illustrated periodical newspapers might well examine the *Bersagliere* issue of the *Illustrazione Italiana* of Milan. It commemorates the fiftieth anniversary of the creation of the corps of *bersaglieri* on June 18, and its doubled or trebled pages are bristling with soldiers, battle scenes, portraits, monuments, etc. The heads of Italian military commanders are very impressive in tone, dignity, intelligence, and manly beauty.

The Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale Vittorio Emanuele at Rome has begun publication of a *Bollettino* of modern foreign works acquired by the Government public libraries of the kingdom. These lists appear bi-monthly, from January, 1886, and are classified. The typography, like that of the *Bollettino* of the Florence Central National Library, is open and attractive. A letter or letters affixed to each title denote the respective libraries (out of the thirty) in which the work is to be found. An asterisk signifies a donation; two asterisks, an international exchange. In the

second number it is pleasant to find a considerable collection of works relating to our civil war acknowledged as a gift to the Victor Emanuel Library from Mr. John S. Pierson, of this city.

The number of admirable reproductions of specimens of early German typography and engraving—of which the 'Kulturgeschichtliches Bilderbuch aus drei Jahrhunderten' and Muther's 'Bücherillustration der Gothik und Frührenaissance' (Leipzig: Hirth) are prominent examples—is fast being augmented. The latest series of publications of this character is issued by Grote of Berlin, under the title 'Deutsche Drucke älterer Zeit in Nachbildungen,' and now comprises three volumes. The first volume is a reproduction of the first edition of Martin Luther's 'Septemberbibel,' published at Wittenberg in 1522, the illustrations being by Lucas Cranach. The second volume is a facsimile of the earliest 'Faust-Buch,' of the original edition of which only five copies are extant. The third volume is the anonymous 'Passional Christi und Antichristi,' first published at Wittenberg, probably in 1521. This work is a series of woodcuts, each underscored with a few lines of descriptive or commentative text. Luther has commonly been credited with the authorship of the text, but the editor's researches trace it to Melancthon, and the woodcuts likewise to Cranach. Luther undoubtedly inspired and advised the composition.

—Two striking portraits of Frank R. Stockton, with a full sketch of his life, are a feature of the *July Century*, the contents of which are agreeably diversified. The irrepressible economic question makes a triple appearance, and the wide differences of view in the three papers enforce the chaotic nature of current opinion in relation thereto with a power all the greater from their immediate juxtaposition. Probably Miss Lazarus, in her delightful narrative of a visit to Merton Abbey, had little intention of setting forth the spirit of modern socialism in one of its most attractive practical forms; but this is what she has best succeeded in doing in the account, without details, of Mr. William Morris's workshops and business methods, while the personality of the poet himself stands out with breadth and frankness and a certain power of character, amid the picturesque and artistic surroundings of his factory. As a piece of brief literary portraiture of a many-sided man the article is remarkably well done. After this glimpse, which reminds us that the Chicago anarchist is not the only type of the socialistic faith, a "manufacturer," Mr. Edward L. Day, gives a rapid and firm-handed review of the status of the laborers since they began to be earners of fixed money-wages, and of trades unionism, and the writer exhibits a temperate judgment, a fair-mindedness, and a sense of difficulties to be met upon any basis of settlement, which are only too rare in the controversy. He concludes with a distinct leaning toward profit-sharing, for which he outlines a scheme of percentages. Last comes a "master-printer," Mr. Theodore L. DeVinne, who describes a co-operative association that failed, and leaves one with the impression that workmen have not enough character to sustain the system. He apparently thinks it can succeed only when the administrative control remains as under the wages system, and the capitalist is content to take the position of a philanthropist. In other words, successful co-operation is only another form of Christian charity; and it must be confessed that historically, so far as co-operative production is concerned, there is plenty of evidence to support this view. One ought not to leave unmentioned the papers by Theodore Roosevelt and Henry Cabot Lodge, who plead very dexterously against the prejudice felt towards fox-hunting or drag-

hunting in this country. Mr. Lodge expects that the farmers of Hamilton and Wenham will begin to follow the hounds and breed hunters "before very long," and says it is a very democratic sport.

—*Lippincott's* has a novelty in the form of a drama by "J. S. of Dale," of which the scene is laid in London; the characters are nearly all well-marked, there is speed and variety in action and situation, and the setting is closely attended to—altogether an excellent and surprising piece of society sketching. There is improvement in the "body" of this writer's work, and as it goes on he may willingly let some of his elaborated details die, which would be a gain; but, as it is, his literary finish is as good as there is among us, as this drama, though a new field for his pen, again proves. In the rest of the magazine Henry Gréville's literary confessions have a taking amiability which the reader yields to with pleasure; and in Joaquin Miller's authentic account of himself one finds the rarest thing in autobiography—a simple, sincere, strong man. The character so unconsciously disclosed earns something more than respect—earns a due of that honor paid to exceptional nobleness. His words are worth a short quotation:

"And now, soon—this year, God willing—I shall stop writing, and, in a small way, take up the law again. For a man who writes constantly cannot think much, and a man who does not think much ought not to have much to say. There is a disposition to selfishness and egotism in writing that is ruinous to all men. A man who makes a profession of writing poetry ought to die early; for if he lives long he will surely suffer deeply. Besides all that, the field of legitimate poetry is so small that no man ought to try to make his bread, much less maintain others, on it. . . . Other immortal gods of song have selected war and celebrated a lot of cruel butchers through all the ages, sowing dragons' teeth in every sounding syllable. I would starve first. . . . And then, with the Bible, Shakespeare, and the Brownings, the world is not greatly in need of more poetry; but it is greatly in need of more fruit, more flowers, and more beautiful gardens."

—The pleasant connection of Carlyle with America, which began with his friendship with Emerson and ended with the bequest of his Cromwell and Frederick books to Harvard College, has an after-episode in a valuable article, which must hold wide attention, by Prof. C. E. Norton in the July *New Princeton Review*. Emerson, in a note to the latter in 1873, though neither of them could have guessed what meaning the injunction would take on, said: "I please myself with believing that you will take care hereafter that his (Carlyle's) memory will suffer no detriment on this side the sea." In the spirit suggested by these words Prof. Norton, having had the original manuscripts under his examination, submits Mr. Froude's editorial work to a brief but very damaging review; and on his own account records a few reminiscences of Carlyle in which he illustrates to what an extent Carlyle's manner, intonation, laugh—in a word, his personality—limited and colored his language in conversation; the spoken words being only one element in the expression of the thought. Thus the way is cleared for a kindlier construction of his words and a more just apprehension of his spirit. These anecdotes—brief records of daily talk—are framed into a general characterization of Carlyle, made with firmness and vigor, of which, perhaps, it is most significant to say that it calls up and harmonizes with the portrait of Carlyle more constantly and directly than any which we have read. The weight of the article, however, is critical, and, though the case is compressed to a degree which leads one to believe that this is not the end of the matter, bears heavily upon Froude. We refer our readers to the author's own statement, as we have space

only to say that Prof. Norton shows that the publication of the 'Reminiscences' without editing of a very thorough kind was never contemplated by Carlyle, and was expressly prohibited while their contents were fresh in his mind; and that the general consent of Carlyle to whatever Froude should choose to do was given when he had no longer any recollection of their substance. Though it should be granted that Froude acted within his verbal right, he is convicted of being an unfit man to hold such a trust. His editing was confined practically to the omission of the paragraphs prohibiting the publication without editing! But it is impossible to compress the care against Froude in smaller limits. In the lesser matters of editorial labor there can be no excuse for the negligent manner in which the manuscript got printed. Gross carelessness is charged and proved. Instances are given in profusion, the most amusing error being that by which Sir Henry Taylor is said to be characterized by "morbid vivacity in all senses of that deep-reaching word"—Carlyle having written "marked veracity." Prof. Norton concludes: "A similar indifference to Carlyle's injunctions of privacy, a similar carelessness in the printing of his manuscript, are exhibited in many parts of Mr. Froude's *Life* of him, together with many misstatements of facts and misrepresentations of character and action. I must, however, reserve the proof of this assertion for another occasion. To have placed unlimited confidence in one capable of such dealing with a sacred trust seems to me to have been Carlyle's greatest error. It was an error for which the heaviest penalty has been exacted."

—The addresses delivered before the Johns Hopkins University on the occasion of its tenth anniversary are printed in full in the last Circular. Prof. Welch maintains the rather barren thesis that the final end of hospitals and medical schools is the relief and cure of the sick. Prof. Rowland reaches the inmost secret of successful education when he says that its great object is to produce a man who can do, not simply one who knows; and that to this end the student must be trained from the beginning in doing, not in remembering. The demand of the age is for the man who is able to dispense with the instincts which were his guide in infancy, and to decide from reason what to believe and how to act in the daily routine and the emergencies of life. He neither accepts the opinions which have been taught him as final, nor attempts to construct opinions of his own unassisted by the labors of others. He has a longing for the truth, and he is willing to test himself, to test others, and to test nature until he finds it. He differs as widely as possible from the unscientific person whose characteristic is, that he is willing to accept and to make statements of whose meaning he has no clear conception to begin with, and of whose truth he is not assured. The former is the mind which has built up modern science, which is destined to govern the world in the future and to solve problems pertaining to politics and humanity as well as to inanimate nature, and which the physical laboratory is peculiarly well adapted to produce. Prof. Gildersleeve maintains that all healthy literature must be kept in communion with the great masterpieces of antiquity.

—In variety of subjects, interest, and picturesqueness, the concluding prints issued by the Society for Photographing Relics of Old London compare favorably with any previous twelve in the whole 120. No less than four are representations of chimney-pieces of marked beauty or elaboration of carving—that in the court-room of the New River Company, attributed to Grinling Gibbons, taking the palm. One plate is devoted

to three canopied doorways, suggestive of the days when umbrellas were unknown, but also noticeable for the fine proportions of the several parts of the doors themselves. In one case we seem to see the button of the electric bell in the jamb, flanked on one side by the ancient knocker, and on the other by "one of the old extinguishers used for putting out links or torches." A sheet of bric-à-brac, so to say, exhibits London Stone in its securely grated cell; an ecclesiastical hour-glass mounted on a high metal standard; a church clock, with figures striking bells—a relic of the demolished St. Dunstan's in the West; and two sculptured emblems—"the Boy at Pie Corner" marking the staying of the Great Fire there which had begun at Pudding Lane, and was appropriately attributed to the sin of gluttony. Of exteriors, the most poetic is St. John's Gate, Clerkenwell, with a charming vista under the arch; but one may also admire the lines and members of Emanuel Hospital, Westminster. Good architecture, too, in its way, is the Tennis Court in James Street, Haymarket. The south entrance of Great St. Helen's; some old houses in the Strand antedating the Great Fire; and a bit of Queen Anne's Gate, showing the statue of the good Queen herself, complete the present series. We must repeat our regret that this useful and instructive enterprise is now brought to a close. The pains involved in selecting subjects, photographing them, and describing them in the letter-press with the aid of much laborious research, have fallen in the greatest measure on Mr. Alfred Marks, who now takes a grateful leave of subscribers not less grateful in turn, we are sure. Some few sets are procurable for a while by addressing Mr. Marks at No. 155 Adelaide Road, South Hampstead, London, N. W.

—The June number of *Les Lettres et les Arts* (Paris: Boussod, Valadon & Cie.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons) contains a longer list than usual of illustrations, but the articles are fewer and consequently longer than they generally are. M. Paul Bourget begins the number with a short story, "Ruse de guerre," such as M. Bourget might be expected to write, exquisite in literary form and execution, and, unlike his other productions, gay rather than sad in tone. It is illustrated by Mme. Madeleine Lemaire and M. Saint-Elme Gautier. The *chandelier* of the latter artist which begins the story, and the one which closes it, are gems of suggestive illustration. M. Barbey d'Aurevilly has a poem, "La Haine du Soleil," full of fire and passion and tempestuous harmony, a powerful and not a sympathetic poem, but inspired by true poetic feeling. Then follows "Louis XV. et Madame de Pompadour: Statues de Pigalle," by M. A. Chabouillet, a long and learned and interesting article, richly illustrated with reproductions of famous works of art of the period—statues, portraits, pictures; among these, Boucher's charming picture of Mme. de Pompadour seated under the trees of a park. M. Paul Hervieu has an exquisitely executed sketch: "Tom Bred et John Bred, jockeys," in which all his artistic excellence of conception, all his sober elegance of language, is lavished upon a most uninteresting and even disagreeable subject. M. Albert Guinon writes in a lively way about the actress Mlle. Jeanne Granier, a full-length aquarelle of whom, by Mme. Madeleine Lemaire, accompanies the article. Then follows a duet of six pages, by M. E. Paladilhe, "Au bord de l'eau: Musique sur une poésie de M. Sully-Prudhomme," which ends with an exquisite little picture by Adrien Moreau. But by far the cleverest thing in the number is the "Délégué au Salon: Notes d'un voyageur," by M. Louis Ganderax, who appears here even more mordant as a writer upon art than he does as a dramatic critic in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*. The arti-

cle is lavishly illustrated at almost every leaf by large, full-page reproductions of many of the most important pictures and statues of the present Salon. Among them are Bouguereau's "Printemps," which is the frontispiece of the number, Benjamin-Constant's "Justinien," "Quand on devient vieux" of Israëls, "L'Hyménée" of Chartran, "Les Hiérodoules" of Rosset-Granger, and Bernier's beautiful landscape in Brittany, "Le Vallon," which is most effectively rendered.

—Vol. vii. of the *Goethe-Jahrbuch* compares favorably with any of its predecessors. Its contents appear under the three rubrics: New Communications, Essays, and Miscellanies. An appendix gives the first report of the new Goethe Society of which the *Jahrbuch* is hereafter to be the official organ, and with this report are incorporated the by-laws of the Society and a list of its members. A second appendix contains the Constitution and a list of members of the Goethe Society recently founded in England. The copious bibliography published in each successive number of the *Jahrbuch* (there are eighty pages of it in this last volume) seems to demonstrate that Herman Griem was within the bounds of the most sober truth when he said that henceforward there is to be a science called Goethe, just as for some centuries there have been sciences known by the names of Homer, Shakespeare, and Dante. Of the "Essays" above mentioned the most valuable is one by G. Dehio, entitled "Alt-italienische Gemälde als Quelle zum Faust." The conclusion of "Faust," or that part which follows the death of the hero, has always been rich in problems for the student. Critics of the temper of Vischer, who find fault with the poet for converting his work at the last into a Catholic mystery-play, simply shrug their shoulders over this final portion as a pitiable senility. But even those who are content to take the drama as it stands, and whose endeavor it is "to understand the poet by going into the poet's land," find difficulty here in carrying out their laudable programme. Whence came that grotesque imagery of the battle between the devils and the angels? Whence came the last scene, with its mountain-gorges, waving forests, gentle lions, holy anchorites, and all the rest? It has generally been thought that this "scenery" was worked out by Goethe chiefly from hints found in his reading; that the hermits' mountain was Montserrat, of which he had read in a book of travels, and that a good part of the details were mere capricious imaginations of his own. Herr Dehio, however, makes it clear that this was not the case, but that Goethe was here copying three old Pisan frescoes of the fourteenth century, one a representation of the life of the early Christian hermits in the Thebaid, another being entitled "Hell," and the third "The Triumph of Death." These pictures were engraved and published by Lasinio in 1822, and Goethe is known to have been interested in them. Copies of these reproductions are now given in the *Jahrbuch*, and it must be admitted that they are the most valuable of all commentaries to the latter part of "Faust." Not only in his general *mise en scène*, but in a multitude of incidental and often fantastic details, has the German poet reproduced the unknown painter of Pisa. And so we have another verification of that deepest and most useful of all maxims for the understanding of Goethe, namely, that his starting-point is not a mental abstraction, but a corporeal form. As Schröder states it:

"Goethe geht vom Bilde aus."

—But by far the most interesting part of the *Jahrbuch* is a batch of letters written by Goethe, while a student at Leipzig, to his sister Cornelia and to his friend Behrisch. In these letters German alternates with English and French, and, taken together, they give us a delightful picture

of clever but unspoiled boyhood, and also of the later Goethe in the chrysalis state. The lad felt proud of his English. Under date of May 11, 1766, he writes of his occasional melancholy moods and of his resorting to verse-making for relief. "But hark ye," he says, "in like a situation of my soul, I make english verses, . . . english verses that a stone would weep. In that moment thou shalt have of them. Think on it sister thou art a happy maiden to have a brother who makes english verses. I pray thee be not haughty thereof." Then follow ten stanzas entitled, "A Song over the Unconfidence toward myself," three of which are as follows:

"Then fogs of doubt do fill my mind
With deep obscurity;
I search my self and cannot find
A spark of Worth in me."

"When tender friends, to tender kiss,
Run up with open arms;
I think I merit not that bliss
That like a kiss me warmeth."

"An other thought is misfortune
Is death and night to me;
I hum no supportable tune
I can no poet be."

The dubious rhyme, *arms: warmeth*, recurs in some verses to Behrisch on the pleasures of innocent love:

"What pleasure, God! of like a flame to burn,
A virtuous fire, that ne'er to vice can turn.
What voluptu, when trembling in my arms,
The bosom of my maid, my bosom warmeth!"

The following may be taken as at once a specimen of the youngster's English style and as a commentary upon his later well-known saying, "Der Umgang mit Frauen ist das Element guter Sitten":

"Often sister I am in good humor. In a very good humor! Then I go and visit pretty wives and pretty maiden. St! Say nothing of it to the father. —But why should the father not know it? It is a very good school for a young fellow to be in the company and acquaintance of young virtuos and honest ladies. The fear to be hated by them makes us fly many excesses seducing by his outward side and therefore perilous to the Youth. Look Sister, that is the State of my present life: I seek to do nothing of what I could not give reason to my superiors, which are God and my parents; I seek to further please to the uttermost part of men, wise and fools, great and littles, I am diligent, I am mirthy, I am lucky. Adieu."

AN EYE-WITNESS OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

The Despatches of Earl Gower, English Ambassador at Paris from June, 1790, to August, 1792, to which are added the Despatches of Mr. Lindsay and Mr. Monro, and the Diary of Viscount Palmerston in France during July and August, 1791, now published for the first time. Edited for the Syndics of the University Press by Oscar Browning, M.A., F.R. Hist. S., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, and University Lecturer. Cambridge: at the University Press; New York: Macmillan. 8vo, pp. 400.

MR. BROWNING is right in thinking the documents contained in this volume a welcome contribution to our knowledge of a very confused epoch:

"They are not," he says in his preface, "of an exciting character, nor do they show great insight or penetration. They are careful accounts written week by week by a competent and well-placed observer for the information of his Government, and they are perhaps more valuable because the writer did not comprehend the full significance of the events which he describes. The French Revolution has been so often lifted by sensational writers into the region of cataclysmal and almost superhuman occurrences, that a narrative is specially acceptable which tends to range it among the facts which appeal to our ordinary experience."

The account of the September massacres by Mr. Monro is exciting enough; but certainly Lord Gower's despatches, in spite of his uneasy feeling, frequently repeated, that some great crisis was at hand, do not read at all like the premonitions of a great and bloody revolution.

These despatches, together with those of Mr. Lindsay and Mr. Monro, give a nearly continuous view of the course of events from the summer of 1790 to the death of the King. After this the Terror set in, and there is a blank in the information obtained by the English court for a full year. "After the declaration of war between France and England in February, 1793, Paris was hermetically sealed. No effort on the part of our Ministry or of Lord Elgin, our representative in Flanders, could penetrate the obscurity; all who were suspected of giving information were put in prison or guillotined. The veil did not lift until the summer of 1794, when an unknown but well-informed correspondent in Switzerland was able to send to Lord Elgin some remarkable accounts of the political, military, and social condition of France. These reports are printed at the end of this volume." No part of the volume is more interesting than these reports (written in January and February). They present a most graphic picture of the despotism that then held sway, and make plain the policy and methods by which the Committee of Public Safety had managed to bring all the resources of the country under its control, and to present to the enemy an absolutely unbroken front, and a concentration of military and moral force before which the half-hearted invaders were incapable of standing.

The events of the first year, as depicted by Lord Gower, give no sign of the terrible catastrophe that was approaching. The violence and excitement of 1789 had passed away, and every one would have said that affairs were settling into quiet. Even after the King's flight, the Conservative party seem to have held their own, and even to have effected something of a reaction. More than once we are told that the Extremists are discouraged and are losing ground; and this is the impression given by the tone of the despatches. The new Constitution went into operation quietly and successfully, and it is hard to find, in these pages, any adequate reasons for the revulsion of the next summer. Nevertheless, all through this second year, as we have already remarked, Lord Gower was predicting some serious crisis near at hand. Its indications were in the air rather than in any specific facts and events that he is able to put upon record. What we do note here, however—and this is the most serious sign of the times—is the excessive weakness of the Government. Society appears to be falling to pieces. There are no great convulsions or disorders, but all France—army, navy, and civil organization—is distracted with petty conclusions and disorders, which the Government is utterly unable to control, and which indeed are regarded as the generous expression of the spirit of freedom, rather than as the signs of approaching anarchy. A strong man at this juncture, it would seem, might have saved society; for the well-meaning elements still had the upper hand, and a competent leader could have given them the victory. But Mirabeau was dead, and Lafayette—honorable, able, courageous, constantly appearing in these pages as the most eminent and respected man of the time—was not a leader such as the crisis demanded.

It is in these months, from the going into effect of the Constitutional monarchy in October, 1791, to the disorders of the early summer of 1792, that one feels most clearly that there is in the despatches no "great insight or penetration." Lord Gower, it is true, saw the crisis approaching, but he does not make his readers see it, and his accounts, unless supplemented by such details as we find in Taine or Von Sybel, fail to prepare us for what is coming. The 20th of June, the 10th of August, the 2d of September, even after all that has gone before, come upon us with a kind of surprise.

Two circumstances especially deserve to be

mentioned in relation to this period. In the first place, there appears during the year 1791 a surprising degree of material prosperity: frequent mention is made of the high rates at which the church lands were selling, and of the great demand for French manufactures. It is evident that the change in government two years before—constantly alluded to as *revolution*—joined with the reaction against the extremists, had given an impulse to trade and industry which may perhaps be compared with that which followed the civil war in this country; and in all likelihood it, too, was largely speculative, and was deceptive as a sign of prosperity. On the other hand, there are constant and significant indications of the inexperience and want of capacity of the French people in respect to self-government. They recognized the evils of the centralized system which had been established by the Bourbons, and jumped to the opposite extreme in organizing a plan of local self-government which deprived the central Government of all real efficiency. They had no doubt received a powerful stimulus from the successful revolution of the American colonies; but they thought they could improve upon a republican system which was built upon English precedent, and so cast aside the conservative features of the American Constitution. The excessive decentralization, just mentioned; the abolition of the old courts without establishing new ones in their place (p. 36)—thus throwing the administration of justice into confusion; the prohibition of members of the National Assembly from holding seats in the new Assembly, thus depriving themselves of the fruits of experience; the wild and unbalanced theories which governed their actions—these are among the causes and the signs of the collapse of the new Government. A good illustration of this temper, belonging, to be sure, to a later and more excited period, is Danton's assertion (Sept., 1792, p. 252) that "it was impossible to have any constitution but that which was accepted by a majority of the people in the *assemblées primaires*."

The anonymous reports (in French) contain, as we have said, the most interesting statements of the vigor and efficiency of the Revolutionary Government. The anarchy of 1791 had been succeeded by a degree of energy and a concentration of resources of every kind, of which the assailants had no conception. "The republic is richer and calls out more resources than all the sovereigns of the Coalition taken together; for here it is the national wealth of an empire, and the accumulation of wealth for a century in this empire, which are contending against the feeble revenues of a few princes" (p. 327).

We have often been told, most effectively by M. Taine, that France was now controlled by a small minority. This statement is confirmed by our informant (p. 347), who adds: "In fact, the very small minority governs with a rod of iron; another minority follows heartily in the steps of the first, sharing its passions, and executing its designs; authority, attachment to the revolution as a whole, a common desire to preserve it, to perpetuate it, to enjoy it by means of every kind of crime, belong to both these dominant classes. . . . The majority, on the other hand, is an untied faggot, divided into several disunited branches."

The editor has prefixed an introduction of twenty-four pages, summarizing the information contained in the despatches; and has added an index of great value, a complete *onomasticon* of persons and places.

RECENT FRENCH BOOKS.

M. ERNEST LEGOUVÉ, with a chatty communicativeness, has for some years past treated the readers of *Le Temps* to numerous personal reminis-

cences of the literary men of France with whom he came in contact in his youth. He has now fairly begun his autobiography, in which his recollections of others occupy more space than his own personal life and experiences, under the title 'Soixante ans de souvenirs' (Paris: Hetzel; Boston: Schoenhof). Many of the chapters are headed by names well known in letters, and the author is perfectly honest when he tells us that his memoirs ought to be entitled, 'Les Mémoires des autres.' Thus one of the first chapters is headed, "Casimir Delavigne." In it the author relates what he wishes to say of his own youth, of his first verses, of the poem he sent to Delavigne; but by far the greater part of the chapter is given up to a kindly review of the works of an author little read by the present generation. He does the same for Népomacène Lemerrier, and Bouilly and Andrieux. But it is when he comes to speak of Villemain that his sympathy is warmed to the utmost by his admiration for the orator and reader: M. Legouvé is an admirable reader himself, and he takes every occasion to dwell upon the diction of the men whose memories he calls up. Always pleasant memories they are, too, of forgotten or half-forgotten names, once, not in a very remote past, well known by all. Who reads nowadays the 'Ermitte de la Chaussée d'Antin,' by Jouy? Who reads Dupaty? How many can boast of having read 'Le Mérite des femmes,' by Legouvé (or Le Gouvé), the father of our author? Even Eugène Sue is fast passing out of the memories of men. All these and others live again in the delightfully written 'Souvenirs'—delightful and never indiscreet. The author always stops in time not to make them *Confidences*, nor does any portion of them at all answer to the title *Confessions*, yet the personal note, and especially the sympathy of the writer, are always present. Thus M. Legouvé, with commendable filial affection, tries to persuade us that his father's chief poem still lives in the memories of men in spite of its "élégances de style un peu démodées." We are more ready to admit that the thought of the paternal work was an incentive to the author of 'L'Histoire morale des femmes.' As to the other productions of the elder Legouvé, 'La Mort d'Abel,' 'Épicharis et Néron,' 'La Mort de Henri IV.,' they are all interestingly spoken of in the 'Souvenirs,' but the quotations of the weak, insipid Alexandrines of the dying classic tragedy are enough to disprove the praise given to them. M. Ernest Legouvé's tastes may be observed in the chapters, "Les Goûts," "L'Escrime," and in the lively picture of the two fencing masters, Bertrand and Robert; for he is an ardent admirer of the art of fencing, in which he is said to excel. After several chapters on those whom the author calls his initiators in music—Maria Malibran, Chopin, Berlioz—the volume closes with a long chapter on Eugène Sue, whom he knew well, and whose memory he in a measure rehabilitates, presenting his eccentricities and his shortcomings in as favorable a light as possible.

The impression left after reading the 'Souvenirs' is very pleasant. We feel as if we had been listening to an agreeable talker who had many things to tell us, and who cared especially about telling them well, effectively, and dramatically—too dramatically perhaps. We are never tempted to doubt M. Legouvé's veracity; but we feel that he is carried away by the very effort he makes to present his characters vividly before us. We hear them talk: the writer constantly falls into bits of dialogue between himself and the man whom he recalls to us. What he tells us may have been said forty years ago; M. Legouvé tells it all with more accuracy of detail, we might almost say of tone and gesture, than that with which any ordinary mortal could reproduce a scene witnessed the day before. But how can we find fault with a writer of such deli-

cate taste, of such broad sympathies? He loves acting and good-reading as he does fencing, and though he professes admiration for many things besides, it is the love of the dramatic, tempered in his case by a delicate sense of propriety and measure, that makes him write as he does.

On opening the volume 'Œuvres posthumes de René Grousset' (Paris: Hachette; Boston: Schoenhof) we find the portrait of a very young man. René Grousset died in 1885, early in his twenty-fifth year, and yet he had already done enough for his instructors and friends to see the beginning of the realization of his promises as an archaeologist. The 'Étude sur l'Histoire des Sarcophages chrétiens' (Paris: Thorin), which contains the results of his researches while a student in the French school at Rome, was duly appreciated by specialists. And now two of his friends, MM. Doumic and Imbard de la Tour, have collected the literary remains of their brother *normalien*, who had been appointed lecturer at the Faculty of Grenoble shortly before his death. Sainte-Beuve said that there was in every man a poet who died young. In Grousset the poet had not died, as is shown not only by the fifty pages of verse published, but also by some delicate bits of correspondence during his travels in Italy. Two of the essays preserved are entitled *Homeric Studies*: "The Games in honor of Patroclus" and "Helen." But the most important, from a literary point of view, and the longest fragments in the volume are those devoted to the "Société dite des Libertins." In these the young author's aim seems to have been to connect the literary history of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in France. He traces back the need for free inquiry, the spirit of incredulity of the contemporaries of Voltaire and D'Alembert, to the strong undercurrents of scepticism which had received the name of *libertinage* in the sixteenth century. A *libertin*, to the contemporaries of Molière and Bossuet, was a free-thinker—one who rejected authority in all things—authority of Church or State or the received canons of literature and art; a man who indulged in his *sentiments particuliers* (to use the expression of the times). Grousset is not at all in sympathy with the *libertins*. He became, as the biographical notice written by his friends informs us, a faithful son of the Church very soon after the close of his college studies. After relating the horrible end of Vanini, whose tongue was pulled out before he was given over to the flames, he merely adds that this spectacle made all who had known Vanini reflect. To our author, in spite of his knowledge of the facts, a *libertin* becomes identified, not so much with men like Vanini or Gasendi, as with those who were to a certain extent libertines in the modern sense of the word—men like Théophile Viau or Cyrano de Bergerac. He accepts freely as good authority the 'Histoires' of Tallemant des Réaux in regard to all those who rejected authority as far as it was safe to do so, and that was not very far. It would not be difficult, by the aid of this same Tallemant, to prove that some of the greatest upholders of authority, both in state and in religious matters, were libertines as we now understand the word. It must be confessed that Grousset has to deal with very few of the known names of the seventeenth century. Such men as Desbarreaux and Chapelle were anything but leading spirits; but the spirit that animated them was felt in various ways by Descartes, by Pascal; felt, to be opposed, by Bossuet. Pascal especially was revolted by *l'esprit libertin*, by the doubt of Montaigne. The 'Pensées,' in the opinion of Grousset, contributed more than any other book to give precision to what was before vague in the minds of the *libertins*; for Pascal, in order to refute their opinions, was the first to state them openly.

The essay is evidently hastily finished, for the

author, after a rather feeble analysis of the character of Molière's *Don Juan*, passes rapidly over the end of the century merely to mention Bayle, who presents to the next age "tout l'esprit du libertinage français." The pages which follow on Saint-Evremond are the very best that Grouset wrote. They seem to form a complete, finished chapter of the work he intended to write. Here the author, who analyzes the writings of that delicate Epicurean, has made himself fully master of his subject, and, though not in sympathy with the free-thinking tendencies of Saint-Evremond, he does full justice to the spirit of *tôleration* which he shows to have sprung up among the sceptics, "qui leur appartient en propre, qu'ils ont inventée." The pages on Saint-Evremond alone would justify the loving admiration of the friends who felt that the early death of René Grouset was a loss to literature.

M. Albert Delpit is a successful writer of novels and plays. "Le Fils de Coralie," before it had made the reputation of its author upon the stage, had created a sensation as it appeared in the pages of the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, and the novel is quite as dramatic as the play. His books seem to be written to be turned into plays, and perhaps this is the reason why they have, with all their passion and life, an unreality of conception and of sentiment which does not bear examination, but which the interest of the moment carries the reader over unconsciously, as the sympathy of the spectator does when the plays are presented upon the stage. In the choice of his subjects M. Delpit is always sensational. "Solange de Croix-Saint-Luc," the best story he has written, is a scarcely veiled reproduction of the circumstances which led to and accompanied the famous law-suit in which, a few years ago, the young Duchesse de Chaulnes attempted to recover the possession and guardianship of her children, whom the law had given to their grandmother. M. Delpit has now published, in another manner, a story of the Commune, "Mademoiselle de Bressier" (Paris: Ollendorf; New York: Christern). It is written with the author's customary ease and smoothness, and is full of startling and tragic situations and sentiments; but it does not stir the sympathies of the reader, because the dramatic fire and pathos of the story are those of the stage, not of reality. "Mademoiselle de Bressier" will interest, however; and M. Delpit, without being a great or even a fine writer, always writes well.

Mme. Augustus Craven, who is only English by marriage, has written a number of works that have been received with great favor in the religious and aristocratic world which M. Octave Feuillet also addresses. But the author of "Fleurange" and of "Anne Séverin" has not the literary preoccupations of M. Feuillet, and never forgets the moralist in the artistic creator. Her stories, which are always grave and serene, are at times both interesting and pathetic; her views of life are not broad nor deep, but her moral rectitude and sincerity are great and very attractive. Her new story, "Le Valbriant" (Paris: Perrin; Boston: Schoenhof), like her previous works, is strongly Catholic and royalist. The characters have all the Christian virtues and very few human weaknesses. The tone of perfect good breeding never varies, even in the most moving circumstances, and the interest, without being at any time painful, is always sufficient to carry the reader to the end. The most interesting thing about the book, however, is the success with which the author has rendered the moral atmosphere of a certain narrow but extremely interesting world—that which produced the *Alliette* of "La Morte."

M. André Theuriet, who can be so satisfactory at times, is not always, nor even often, happy in the choice of his subjects. His latest novel, "Hé-

lène" (Paris: Charpentier; New York: Christern), has many fine passages, as his books always have—much exquisite description of nature and of the impressions produced by it upon his characters; much fine analysis of temperaments and feelings. But the people he shows us are all so devoid of any charm or fineness of character or of sentiment that the story often becomes distasteful, and at times positively disagreeable. M. Theuriet deprives his characters of all the nobler qualities, as a physiologist experiments upon his pigeons and his frogs, and then he minutely observes and describes the actions of the maimed creatures. The result is a story even more depressing than his stories generally are, which at the end leaves the reader unmoved and unsympathetic and dissatisfied with the author, though conscious of the fine qualities of the writer.

"Bigarreau" (Paris: Lemerre; Boston: Schoenhof), another new volume by M. André Theuriet, contains, besides the charming story which gives the name to the collection, some of the author's finest and most delicate writing. When M. Theuriet writes a short story, he is at his very best. Touching, tender, and human, a poet and a painter in one, he moves the heart and gratifies the poetic fancy at the same time. "Bigarreau" and "La Pamplina" are perfect in their way, never going beyond the limitations of the author's best performance. "L'Oreille d'Ours," the sad little romance of the writer's old neighbor, related through the recollections of his own boyish days, is delightful, with its blending of tender sympathy for the old woman and the boy who have both gone out of his life. With "La Saint-Nicolas" M. Theuriet gives his volume a happy ending, almost the only one in all his writing. The stories are well worth reading, and they bring back the author who charmed us long ago with "Mademoiselle Guignon" and "Le Journal de Tristan."

A Diary of Two Parliaments. By Henry W. Lucy. The Gladstone Parliament. 1880-1885. Cassell & Co. 1886.

MR. LUCY'S second volume is hardly as amusing as the first, perhaps because the style has less of novelty; but it is even more interesting, inasmuch as it foreshadows, all the more forcibly because unconsciously, the great events of this year. The Irish members occupy a large place—not politically, for the book avoids politics to a degree which detracts from its interest and makes it sometimes unintelligible—but personally; and though Mr. Lucy does not like them, he tries to be fair towards them and does not go much beyond poking fun at their peculiarities. The following passage is very striking in view of later events:

"Lord Hartington's public career is a paradox that grows more puzzling the more closely it is considered. He is a statesman *malgré lui*. But still more against the grain, as it lies on the surface, is the company in which he finds himself. It is impossible to conceive of two men more absolutely opposed to each other in temperament and habit of thought than Lord Hartington and Mr. Gladstone, and in less degree this holds good as between the Secretary of State for India and his other colleagues. In social life Lord Hartington's intimate friends are chiefly found on the other side of the House. Thus he lives a dual life, which adds largely to the complexity of the situation. On the Irish policy of the Government, what is called society does not hesitate to speak in uncompromising terms. Lord Hartington mixes a good deal in certain coteries of society where Lord Beaconsfield is held in higher esteem than is Mr. Gladstone. The Marlborough Club, for example, is not a political institution, but it is, therefore, the more dangerous as a place of resort for weak-kneed Liberals."

That Mr. W. E. Forster's government of Ireland was a failure, there can hardly be a question, though, as Mr. Lucy says, "that he made the effort honestly and earnestly, sparing himself no

pains, probably even Mr. Biggar would not deny." "In the days when he was restrained by official responsibilities, there was something pathetic in his patience under attack. That he felt the blows, could be seen at a glance. But when he rose to speak he never met personality with retort, but set himself to answer the real or fancied grievance with painstaking minuteness. To-day all the suppressed indignation and anger of those days blazes forth." The description of this attack (p. 311) on Mr. Parnell is really thrilling, and forms one of those scenes which make the House of Commons the most dramatic stage of public life in the world.

Of course the central figure throughout the book is Mr. Gladstone, and it is a wonderful picture of the man in his strength and his weakness. It would be difficult to believe what is set down even in this matter-of-fact diary, were it not that after reading the three hours' speech which he made last winter upon home rule, one is prepared to believe almost anything. "It is the opinion of those who have been familiar with Mr. Gladstone's work through many years, that he is only now (1880) reaching the prime of his powers. One gets tired of recording that his latest speech excelled those that have gone before. But to listeners it seems perfectly true." However empty the House may be, it fills up again as soon as Mr. Gladstone begins to speak; and the way in which he holds a crowded audience spell-bound for two and three hours at a time seems almost miraculous. However weary and even ill he may seem in his seat, he is no sooner on his feet than all signs of fatigue disappear. When the debate on the Compensation for Disturbances Bill was turning badly against the Government, Mr. Lucy says (p. 66): "It seemed a hopeless task for any man to reunite the Ministerialists, inspire them with enthusiasm, beat down the boisterous insolence of the other side, and turn an ignominious defeat into the semblance of a brilliant victory. Yet all this Mr. Gladstone did in a speech of less than half an hour's duration. By the sheer weight of genius, and the force of lofty character, he lifted the debate far above the reach alike of Mr. Gibson and Mr. Forster." His wonderful voice has much to do with this power. "Unconsciously the art of the orator was marvellously displayed in the sonorous tones in which this phrase 'a flood of indignation' was spoken. You could almost hear in it the sound of many waters."

But Mr. Gladstone has the defects of his qualities:

"With all his transcendent genius he is not a good leader of the House of Commons. The business there being, after all, to work, he has a fatal propensity towards the prolongation of talk. He not only talks continuously himself, but is the cause of unnecessary talk in others. It is a fresh tribute to his overmastering personality that when he is present the whole debate revolves round him. Members speak directly to or at him, in contravention of the elementary rule which requires all speech to be addressed to the Chair. This would not be, or certainly would not be to so great an extent, if Mr. Gladstone could affect insensibility or indifference. Whoever may be the speaker, however absolutely unimportant his remarks, Mr. Gladstone pricks up his ears and follows the speech with avid attention; and, by interjecting observations, often makes a conversation of what should be a debate. "All this is very bad for the business of the House. But it must be still worse for Mr. Gladstone. The pitcher that goes too often to the well will be broken at last. Night after night the Premier needlessly risks fracture. It is impossible for him to half do anything. If he could be forcibly kidnapped every night at half past eleven, taken home and put to bed, though the procedure would be highly illegal, it would at the same time greatly add to length of years with him and conduce to the speedier progress of the business he has at heart."

Again:

"What took place on Tuesday morning forms

a striking example of the unfortunate influence which the personal impressionability of the Premier exercises upon Parliamentary affairs. It was, regarded from a dramatic point of view, a fine and moving spectacle when at last Lord Percy and his friends succeeded in making the Lion roar. They had been poking at the cage fully an hour, and had drawn forth nothing more pleasing or exciting than some vigorous shaking of the head and one or two monosyllabic ejaculations. Mr. Gladstone was evidently conscious of the undesirability of yielding to temptation. He might easily crush these young men, but at what expense! The whole of a night had been already wasted. It was early morning when the Minister for War had found an opportunity of rising and making his statement explanatory of the estimates. It was absolutely necessary that certain votes should be taken before the House adjourned. Every one except Mr. Gladstone was weary with the long sitting and worn out with watching for the coming of the Chairman of Committees.

"These thoughts were evidently present in Mr. Gladstone's mind, and, fleeing from temptation, he vacated his usual seat by the despatch-box. If he had gone a little further, left the House altogether and gone home to bed, it would have been better for himself and public business too. He was like a man conscious of his own weakness in the face of drink, but who could not make up his mind totally to abstain. He went on the temperance principle, and, instead of leaving the House altogether, took up his seat at the lower end of the Treasury bench, under the shadow of the Speaker's chair. But this required only a little lengthening of the arm on the part of his pursuers, and presently they succeeded in drawing him. Since the night when, in Opposition, he suddenly turned and rebuked Mr. Chaplin, who had gone a pace too far, nothing has been finer in its way than his discomfiture of Lord Percy on Tuesday morning. The spare figure, trembling with indignation, bending forward as if preparing for a spring; the flashing eyes, the extended hand, and the ringing voice, combined to form an effective scene, the like of which no other stage in the world could parallel. It was magnificent, but it was not business."

It has been often remarked what a difference of results is produced by the difference of size of the House of Commons as compared with our House of Representatives. In the vast space of the latter every member is provided with a comfortable chair and a desk, and there is plenty of room to move about. But, owing to the distance and the irrelevant noises, it is impossible for a speaker to be heard, and there is no community of impulse or motion. On the other hand, in a full House of Commons, members cannot even find seats on the benches, but stand crowded round the doorways and the Speaker's chair like the audience in a theatre where only standing room is left. But they have their reward. The effect is like that of a group of men gathered around a fire. Every joke, every successful sarcasm, every bit of real or mock eloquence, every individual characteristic, acts upon the whole body, and cheers and laughter, or indignation and hooting, electrify the whole House. If the House of Commons was not, by this means, the most interesting and exciting club in the world, it would be hardly possible for men, many of whom are engaged in active occupations during the day, to attend, during six months, sessions which end from midnight to four or five o'clock in the morning.

The Azores or Western Islands: A Political, Commercial, and Geographical Account. By Walter Frederick Walker. London: Trübner. 1886.

MR. WALTER FREDERICK WALKER is a member of the Royal Geographical Society; but his first sentence shows how exceedingly incomplete the library of that excellent institution must be, at least in its Azorean alcove. He says that it is forty-five years since Bullar's work on the Azores appeared, and that it is "the last work in our language purely descriptive of these delightful islands." So far is this from the truth that there have appeared in the United States alone, during

that time, no less than three works "in our language" purely descriptive of the Azores; these being 'A Trip to the Azores,' by M. Borges de F. Henriques (Boston: 1867); 'Among the Azores,' by Lyman H. Weeks (Boston: 1882); and 'A Summer in the Azores, with a Glimpse of Madeira,' by C. Alice Baker (Boston: 1882). Each of these volumes gives a greater variety of information about the present condition of the islands than is contained in Mr. Walker's book, he devoting himself almost exclusively to the only island much visited by his countrymen, San Miguel or St. Michael. Of course he did not intentionally ignore these predecessors, but he simply adds another to the many proofs that English bibliography has its limitations.

Among these various recent writers on the Azores there is not one who has taken so much pains with their early history as Mr. Walker. Yet even here his reading finds anew its limitations; for he apparently has never heard of the one painstaking historical book written and published in any of the islands, the 'Annaes da ilha Terceira,' by Francisco Ferreira Drummond, "natural da mesma ilha," the first and only volume of which, published by the municipal council of Angra do Heroismo in 1850, now lies before us. Its 700 dingy pages are a mine of minute history, such as no historian of the islands can properly ignore. Nor does Mr. Walker make any reference to the few modern productions of the islands, in the way of belles-lettres, as, for instance, 'Contos e Poesias Açorianas,' by Ernesto Rebello, printed at Horta, Fayal, in 1873. He, moreover, discusses at great length the alleged Phœnician remains which so interested Humboldt, and confidently assumes that no such exist. This is probably true, but Mr. Walker is evidently ignorant of the curious inscription imbedded in the floor of an old church built about A. D. 1500 at Cedros, Fayal—an inscription concerning which there exists no explanation or tradition, although it has been suggested that it is probably of the same class with certain inscriptions in Belgian churches built under Philip II.; these memorials having long passed as Runic, but turning out at last to be in Latin, inscribed in a bastard Greek alphabet. A report on this Fayal stone may be found in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society* (vol. x, part i, p. xvi), and it perhaps does more than anything else to explain the origin of Humboldt's supposed Phœnician remains at the Azores.

Mr. Walker's book is written in a style of no especial literary attractions, but he gives a good deal of valuable information. Had he employed only the modest title claimed many years ago by Dr. J. W. Webster for his work on the same subject, 'A Description of the Island of St. Michael, with Remarks on the Other Azores,' he would have characterized his own work more accurately. Even within this limit, his descriptions of the far-famed gardens of Ponta Delgada—the chief attraction to strangers in his favorite island—are far less ample and interesting than those given by Mr. Weeks in his 'Among the Azores.' Mr. Walker's maps, however, are excellent; and he outdoes all his predecessors by publishing the notes and words of several popular Portuguese melodies, as the "Vivandeira" and the "Lagrimas," although he does not give us "Viva bella Criadagem," the prettiest of them all. It is the more remarkable that he should have taken this trouble, because he finds the Azorean Portuguese language "harsh and discordant" (p. 311)—a phrase not at all descriptive, certainly, of the sweet drawing sing-song of the more western Azores.

Das Leben Raphael's. Von Herman Grimm. Zweite Ausgabe des ersten Bandes und Ab-

schluss in einem Bande. Berlin: Wilhelm Hertz; New York: Westermann. 1886.

WHEN Herman Grimm published the first volume of his *Life of Raphael* (1872), he proposed to write a second, containing a life of the great painter based on original documents, and a critical study of his works. Finding it impossible to carry out this plan for want of material, he abandoned it, and determined to remodel his first volume, which, in its new and greatly improved form, now lies before us. The original introduction has grown into a history of the fame of Raphael from his death to the present time. The Italian text (second edition) of Vasari's life, with lengthy commentaries between each chapter, has been replaced by an unbroken reprint of the texts of the first (1550) and second (1568) editions of the same, with a German translation of the latter *en regard*; and an essay has been added on the "Sposazio," the "Entombment," the "Camera della Segnatura," the Cartoons, the Sistine Madonna, and the "Transfiguration," with short references to other well-known works. The volume closes with a chapter in which the five Sonnets of Raphael are given in their different versions, with accompanying translations.

In his valuable bibliographical essay, entitled 'Les Historiens et les Critiques de Raphael' (note, p. 51), M. Eugène Müntz characterizes the first edition of Grimm's *Life* as "a systematic and paradoxical work, in which the author has taken pains to refute and depreciate Vasari and Passavant, the two men who have given us the most valuable information about Raphael." This charge, so far as it relates to Vasari, cannot be brought against the book in its present shape, as the author not only does him the honor to reprint and translate his *Life of Raphael*, but furthermore makes the *amende honorable* for previous depreciation, by acknowledging that "it is the chief source of our knowledge of the painter's life and career," and "that it is in the main trustworthy." Those who know how many of Vasari's errors have been detected and rectified of late years by Milanesi, Cavalcaselle, Müntz, and Lermolieff, will consider the above qualification justified. Perhaps, says Grimm, when Vasari began to collect materials for his 'Life,' Rome was full of legends about Raphael, among which he selected for his purpose those which seemed to him most worthy of credence. In regard to Passavant's work, Grimm seems to us to be actuated by an equally fair spirit. He considers the biographical portion to be of little value, but he lauds the second part as "a masterpiece of German research," and such indeed it is.

The most interesting and the most original part of the present volume is the first chapter, in which the author traces the decline of Raphael's fame after his death, to its upward tendency at the close of the last century. The first kept pace with the decadence of art in all its branches, which reached its lowest stage in the wild extravagances of the *baroque* and *Zopf* periods. The second set in about a hundred years ago, thanks to leaders of thought and taste like Goethe, who coupled Raphael with Homer and Shakspeare in their esteem; and when, early in the nineteenth century, the artistic spoils of Italy and Spain, including the largest number of Raphael's pictures ever collected under one roof, were displayed in the Louvre, the supremacy of the Prince of Painters was still more widely acknowledged. His fame increased still further, as engravings of his works, beginning with Desnoyers's "Belle Jardinière," were spread abroad, and it culminated in our own day when photographic reproductions of them, at small cost, are found in every part of the civilized world. "The knowledge and the possession of Raphael's works," says our author, "has become essential to human

culture. Men have come to regard them as integral parts of their well-being."

Having but a limited space at his command, and many really important questions concerning the master to discuss, one can hardly understand why Grimm has thought it worth while to devote no less than forty pages to the worn-out question as to the real subject of the "School of Athens." The theories of Vasari and Giorgio Mantovano, and the modern suggestion, which has found little favor in the eyes of competent critics, that it is "St. Paul preaching at Athens"—a suggestion which, as it seems to us, our author treats with more respect than it deserves—would appear to be completely controverted by the fact that Raphael adopted and always adhered to certain types in representing the Apostles, as well as by the certainty that had he intended to represent St. Paul as preaching at Athens he would have placed him on the Hill of Mars and not in a Roman temple. Finally, the painter would not have symbolized the fresco in a medallion figure of Philosophy had his subject been taken from the Acts of the Apostles.

In conclusion, we may mention two points on which Grimm's statements are controvertible—viz.: one concerning the weaving of the tapestries, which he says was accomplished at Arras; the other relating to the painting of the "Transfiguration," which he believes to have been finished by Raphael. In the second edition of his 'Life of Raphael,' p. 478, M. Müntz quotes M. Pinchard's 'Histoire générale de la Tapisserie,' to show that the manufacture of tapestries in the upright frame at Arras ceased in 1477—i. e., between thirty and forty years before the Cartoons were executed—and on p. 479 cites a legal act of the 14th June, 1532, which proves that the tapestries were woven from them by Pierre Van Aelst, the chief tapestry weaver at Brussels during the first third of the sixteenth century.

Concerning the completion of the "Transfiguration" by Giulio Romano after Raphael's death, the evidence seems no less conclusive. Two years after it occurred, Count Castiglione wrote to the Cardinal Giulio de' Medici, who had commissioned Raphael to paint the picture, at the price of 655 gold ducats, for a church at Narbonne, asking him to pay Giulio a certain sum (224 gold ducats) for his work upon the "Transfiguration." As Penni, who was employed with Giulio to finish the pictures left incomplete by Raphael, is not mentioned in the Count's letter, it is fair to conclude that he had no hand in the work, but it seems no less clear that it was done by Giulio.

Handbuch der Verfassung und Verwaltung in Preussen und dem deutschen Reiche. [Handbook of the Constitution and Administration in Prussia and the German Empire.] Von Graf Hue de Grais, 5te Auflage. Berlin: Julius Springer. 1886.

SINCE its first appearance in 1881, this work has been revised and reissued yearly, and has earned the well-deserved reputation of being the best, in fact the only adequate, exposition of the Prussian and German Governments which exists in a comparatively condensed form. The bulk of the book is devoted to Prussian matters, not only because Prussia occupies the more important field in the author's view, but doubtless also because so many of the laws and regulations of the Empire are but copies of Prussian models. The work is, as its name implies, merely a description of constitutional and administrative provisions of the Empire and monarchy, and contains very little historical matter, almost nothing that can be called theorizing, and but few criticisms of existing conditions. With German formality it is divided into chapters, headings, and numbered paragraphs, and is written in an involved style

which is concise, but not always clear on first reading. It is necessarily only a sketch, and often gives but the barest outline where one would gladly pursue the matter further. The book is supplied with abundant notes, which, however, for the most part refer to works rarely accessible to the American reader.

When one considers how young the Empire still is and of what various elements composed, he will naturally be struck, in reading this work, with the rapidity with which comparative unification has been brought about. The reason therefor the author himself gives (p. 13), basing it on the thorough practicalness of the imperial legislation. This has one drawback, especially to the German mind, in that it lacks system. That will doubtless come later. In the meantime, the several members are learning that their best interests are closely bound up with those of the Empire; and though no constitutional change can be made in the internal regulation of any State, or in its relation to the Empire, without its own consent, each year brings some further success of the imperial Government in this direction.

In the minds of many Americans it is not clear whether there exist one or two legislative chambers for the Empire. This is doubtless owing to the fact that not only does the Bundesrath prepare bills for the consideration of the Reichstag, but its consent is also necessary for the confirmation of those originating in the latter body. Its functions are, however, rather executive than legislative, and its power over administrative affairs very considerable. Its members do not vote according to their individual convictions, but in accordance with instructions from the Governments of their respective States. As any constitutional measure can be defeated by fourteen opposing votes, Prussia, having seventeen votes, has the power to dictate at least what shall not be done when any important change is proposed. The members of the Bundesrath cannot be members of the Reichstag; but they have the right of attending the sittings of the latter, and, on demand, can at any time have the floor. The same holds true of the Prussian Ministers in the House of Representatives (*Abgeordnetenhaus*) of the Landtag. Here are precedents worth considering in the much-discussed question whether our Cabinet officers should be heard in Congress. The Reichstag is the legislative body of the Empire; and its members are elected by universal suffrage and direct vote, which is very different from the elaborate Prussian system of indirect vote based upon the comparative amount of tax paid by the respective citizens.

In reference to Prussia's greatness, our author calls attention to two important facts in that nation's history, viz., (1) that its rapid gain of power in foreign relations and its internal development "have been essentially the work of its princes" (p. 31); and (2) "that it was essentially the absolute form of the Government (*Staatsform*) which we have to thank for our magnificent development in the last century" (p. 32). The two truths are so closely interwoven that they are practically one; for with all their ability the Hohenzollerns would have been unable to build up the Prussia of to-day by any other method than compulsion, as German individuality tends naturally to the formation of small communities. With the modern advance of democratic ideas it would be practically impossible to reestablish absolute government in Prussia. That country is still, however, far from adopting the opposite extreme of universal suffrage. The system of electing members of the Landtag is too complicated to be explained in a few words. It must suffice here to say that the voters are divided into three classes based on the census returns of property; so that wealth gives power. At the same time the principle is ap-

plied, which we Americans are slow to learn, viz., that responsibility should ever accompany power. In this respect the Germans criticize our politics severely, in that we have no method of inducing or compelling our best men to assume the cares of government, especially of those seemingly petty, but, in the end, weighty matters of local administration. A wealthy Prussian may have a dozen votes in his district; but in return he must assume the frequently annoying duties of magistracy, and not only serve without pay, but be answerable in the regular courts for the slightest overstepping of the strictly defined bounds of his jurisdiction. Furthermore, if he declines to accept the office, his taxes, already heavy, will be increased one-eighth or one-fourth; or he may adopt an alternative which seems still less attractive, i. e., appoint a substitute, whom not only he will have to pay out of his own purse, but for whose every act he remains answerable in the courts.

The administrative system of Prussia is exceedingly complicated, and, for a foreigner, not always easy of comprehension. The book before us explains it, so far as the author's prescribed limits allow. A knowledge of the details, however, is not necessary for the understanding of a few great principles which lie at the bottom of it, and which are in all probability the secret of its success. In the first place, almost all offices are held practically for life. No slight failure in performance of duty, not even an arbitrary abuse of power, unless it be a great enormity, is considered cause of dismissal. The delinquent may be reprimanded, fined, suspended; but expulsion from the service is so weighty a matter that the unhappy man must either die or emigrate. There remains for him in Prussia no place of public or private trust. A man can therefore make choice of a Government career, and spend years in fitting himself for it, in the certainty that, once accepted in the service, he is practically sure of a comfortable berth for life. The Government not only requires, by rigid examinations, that applicants for office be well fitted for the positions they wish to fill, but it provides institutions of learning with courses specially adapted to the various careers open to a man desiring to enter the Government employ.

Not only are the positions life-long, but the system of pensioning old or disabled officials, or the families of deceased ones, is very complete. The sums thus given seem to an American sometimes ridiculously small. The salaries themselves are very moderate. But Germans, as a rule, are not accustomed to the luxury of American life; and the certainty of a small sum, with comparatively light work, possesses great attraction for them. But this official life possesses still other advantages. Not only does position give a corresponding place in society, but the families of officials in the same department form social circles among themselves. Furthermore, in addition to their salaries, the higher officials receive a fixed sum yearly for entertaining their subordinates, and these entertainments are given in handsome Government apartments provided expressly for this purpose. To these considerations add further the system of conferring orders and honors, from the Black Eagle down, for efficient service. Last, but not least, there is held out the hope of perpetuating one's name in marble, bronze, or other material; if not in the form of a great statue in an open square, or a niche in the Hall of Fame, still in a panel in a public building or a portrait in a museum or picture gallery, there to abide for centuries to be seen and remarked of men.

As a whole, and in spite of obvious disadvantages, the service is so effective, and the protection of the citizens against abuse of power so complete, that the system deserves thorough

study at the hands of those interested in the bettering of our own public administration. For this purpose the book before us furnishes an excellent outline, which will make a good basis for more exhaustive research.

My Study, and Other Essays. By Austin Phelps, D.D.; Professor Emeritus in Andover Theological Seminary. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1886.

THIS is the sixth volume which Prof. Phelps has published within two or three years. It has the general character of his volume before this, 'My Portfolio,' which was lighter and brighter a good deal than the three preceding volumes. It is not strange that there should be such a demand for his writings in certain quarters as to justify such frequent publication. His theology is hard, but his heart is evidently kind. His style is always vigorous. He is opinionated and dogmatic, and he is livelier reading upon these accounts. Whatever his subject, he can manage incidentally to get in a good deal of homely common sense, and the clerical love of a good story is very strong in him. For some of his best stories he is indebted to Emerson, and they are therefore pleasantly familiar. He is more remarkable for the energy than for the accuracy of his literary work. Thus, on page 293, he quotes a considerable passage from Emerson as his description of the Pilgrims. He does not localize it, but it is taken from the essay on Shakspeare in 'Representative Men,' and it has no reference to the Pilgrims whatsoever. On page 200, we read of "William G. Burney, the 'Free Soil' candidate for the Presidency." James G. Birney, the Liberty Party candidate, is probably intended. On page 183 Emerson's description of the "Chardon Street Convention," at which he was a sympathetic looker-on, is disingenuously made to pass for a disparaging description of an anti-slavery meeting. On page 98 Emerson is represented as having said, "Damn George Washington!" in a public lecture, which, except in quotation marks, he could not have done. Wendell Phillips's "God damn the Commonwealth of Massachusetts!" is severely reprobated on page 202. But this is only because the Professor is trying to make out a case against the abolitionists. Elsewhere he leaves the oaths out of his stories with evident reluctance, and hints at secret riches of profanity, and on page 90, telling how the Rev. John Ryland was overwhelmed by the story of the "middle passage," and how "the cultured reverence of years gave way" and he "broke out into a volley of imprecations," he asks: "Can we find it in our hearts to blame him?" Perhaps not. But if not, Phillips's monosyllable should certainly be recommended to mercy in view of the extenuating circumstances of the case.

Prof. Phelps's papers that name his book give an interesting account of his study, the men who have occupied it, its habitual visitors, and the schemes of evangelical enterprise that have had their inception there. A series of papers upon "Retribution" is the most elaborate in the volume. Prof. Phelps would have his readers believe that he maintains the creed of Calvin and Edwards in its original force, but his doctrine of eternal punishment for eternal sin is something foreign to the traditional theology, which argued infinite penalty for infinite sin, and declared that all sin was infinite because it was against an infinite God. Prof. Phelps calls no names, but his article on "The Hypothesis of a Second Probation" is a thundering broadside into the "New Theology," the "Progressive Orthodoxy," so called, of Andover.

Two articles on "The New England Clergy and Anti-Slavery" are hardly less amusing than the most amusing chapters of 'The Innocents

Abroad.' Prof. Phelps contends that the New England evangelical clergy were anti-slavery almost without exception, and that if there had been no abolitionists, the clergy would have put an end to slavery in a way that would have been pleasant all around: in fact, slavery was gradually dying out when the abolitionists began their assault upon it. Webster's 7th of March speech is a sufficient answer to this nonsense, and the recent Garrison volumes to this and all the rest. Those volumes bring us to the year 1840, when abolitionism had attained its maximum growth as a special organization. The abolitionists "more hostile to Christianity than to tyranny" had not then appeared upon the scene. Garrison was still as orthodox as Prof. Phelps. His doctrine of the Sabbath represented a more strict adhesion to the Bible than that of the orthodox party generally. It was not the heresy or infidelity of the abolitionists that alienated the clergy: it was the apathy and timidity and sectarian zeal of the clergy that forced the abolitionists to appeal from the Christianity of the churches to the Christianity of Christ.

The German Soldier in the Wars of the United States. By J. G. Rosengarten. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. 12mo, pp. 175.

WHAT was originally a public lecture has here grown into a volume, after passing through several forms of publication. It contains a carefully compiled list of regiments and of officers of German birth who served on either side in the war of the Rebellion. This may be considered the chief purpose of the book, and will make it useful for reference. In addition to this, the author has gone back to the Old French War, the Revolution, and the Mexican War, and recorded the names of German soldiers, or those of German descent, who took part in them. A good many interesting facts are thus preserved, and some interesting problems are suggested, relating to the early ties between Germany and this country. When, however, the author classes as Germans Gen. Muhlenberg, who was born in Virginia in 1746, with many of the "Pennsylvania Germans" equally natives of the country; traces the Hunters of Kentucky to German *Jägers*, and claims Heintzelman, Custer, Schriver, Shiraz, Ammen, and Haupt, all graduates of West Point and of families native in the country for several generations, as soldiers of German descent, the extent of the claim becomes amusing. One asks, Why not claim the whole by going back to the Saxon invasion of England?

Thoughts. By Ivan Panin. Boston: Cupples, Upham & Co. 1886. Pp. 85.

AT the first glance one perceives that the writer before us is no Russian, at the second glance that he is no thinker: and one is inclined to draw one's pencil through the title as meaningless. But if one continued to mark out all that is meaningless in the volume every page would read "dele." The critic stays his hand, however, for a moment here and there to question introspectively. Thus: Thought 430: "Where I cannot be grateful, I can still be thankful." I cannot be grateful that I am reading this book; am I thankful?

195. "If silence is good for the wise, how much better is it for the foolish." Why, then, is not Ivan Panin silent?

84. "Tolerance saith, hate not those differing with you; Charity saith, hate not those differing from you." Am I intolerant or uncharitable—which?—toward Ivan Panin?

87. "Have patience with the foolish; even to the lot of geese it may befall to save a Capitol." What chance is there that Ivan Panin will save Washington?

94. "Sincere praise may be injudicious; sincere blame always is." How injudicious I am now forced to be!

279. "It detracts naught from the razor that it cannot cut a rock. Say not, therefore, this is false. Rather, see whether thou art not the rock." Am I a rock? Ivan Panin is not a razor. I may say, therefore, this is false.

Thus and so the poor critic questions himself, and turns to the public for sympathy in his perplexities.

The Russian Storm-Cloud; or, Russia in her Relations to Neighboring Countries. By Stepiak, Author of 'Russia under the Tzars,' 'Underground Russia,' etc. [Franklin Square Library.] Harper & Brothers. 1886.

CONSPIRATORS who enter pseudonymously the arena of political and historical discussion enjoy special advantages. They are expected to know and partly to divulge secrets unknown to those who observe and discuss things and events merely as they appear on the surface, and they are, therefore, sure of being eagerly listened to by curious crowds. They can state facts and views with the positiveness of men of action esoterically initiated. They will not be asked for their authorities, for indicating them would be betraying the secrets of the conspiracy as well as the actors in it. They have, on similar grounds, the privilege of speaking vaguely, of veiling a part of an assertion, of using ambiguities. As champions of a cause which is not strong enough to cope with its opponents in the open, they are excused for being passionate, bitter, uncharitable—especially if the cause is one which can appeal to the liberal sentiments of the world, and its defenders are victims of cruel oppression and persecution. Stepiak well knows these advantages, and profits by them without stint, though, to do him justice, without rashly abusing them. As we have repeatedly had occasion to say in these columns, in reviewing his former publications (see Nos. 945 and 1038 of the *Nation*), he is prone to color and exaggerate with the recklessness of a fanatical partisan and combatant, but not to invent and deceive. His 'Russia under the Tzars' seemed to us, in regard to the authenticity of its pictures, to fall somewhat below the level of the earlier 'Underground Russia'; the book before us, which consists of a medley of essays—almost all republished from journals—we deem superior in the same respect to both its predecessors.

And not in that respect alone. Stepiak's main fault is not lack of veracity in expounding views and facts, but lack of seriousness in reading history—contemporaneous or past, Russian or foreign—and superficiality in drawing conclusions: and he has evidently improved a little as a revolutionary student and reasoner since he wrote the preceding publication, and even while preparing the present one for the press. Of the six essays contained in the latter, "The Russian Storm-Cloud" (from which the general title has very improperly been borrowed), "The Russian Army and its Commissariat" (a revolting picture of official corruption), "The Young Poland and Russian Revolution" (written in a pro-Polish spirit which reminds one of Hertzén), "Terrorism in Russia and Terrorism in Europe," "European Socialism and the Dynamite Epidemic," and "A Revolt or a Revolution?" the last shows the most evidences of reflection, doubt, and hesitation in judgment. Here we find broad admissions as to the intellectual advance of Russia under the last Alexander—admissions which belie a considerable portion of the invectives against the Government for its endeavors to stifle all intellectual development; an instance of self-restraint as an assailant in giving a hearing to a calm view—Leroy-Beaulieu's—of the situation in

the Empire of the Czars; and some attempt at balancing the probabilities and chances of the revolutionary movement, including lines like these:

"The Russian revolution must for a certain time be the work of a comparatively small group of men, surrounded by a crowd of irresolute sympathizers. They are quite sincere in their sympathy, often willing to give occasional help to the strugglers. But they have no faith in the possibility of success, and cannot, therefore, throw in their lot with the revolution. To inspire this faith in their hearts, and to convert them into actual supporters, the revolutionists must show their strength in deeds and not in words. The great difficulty is to organize a body sufficiently strong to initiate the insurrection and to keep the field for a certain time. If not suppressed the first day, there are great chances that the thousands and thousands who are now irresolute and hopeless would join the banner of insurrection, rendering it no longer subduable. There is nothing chimerical in such an expectation in countries brimful of disaffection, and history affords some instances of the success of similar attempts. The temptation to try them is, therefore, very great—I may say irresistible. Neither disappointment nor cruel reprisals can prevent their being renewed again and again. Provided latent discontent exist, there will be always people sufficiently bold and willing to risk their heads again and again for such a golden prize."

It is clear to him who compares statements like these with the tone of former Nihilistic utterances, and with the teachings of Russian history, that the late decline of the revolutionary cause—the result of systematically rigorous and ruthless repression—has had a somewhat sobering effect even upon so inveterate workers in subversion *à tout prix* as Stepniak, and that they must do a great deal of arguing to convince themselves that this enterprise is not chimerical. In doing this they confound fierce serf risings, political assassinations, and regicidal attempts, in which Russian history abounds, with real revolutionary movements, of which in the annals of the Russian Empire there is only one solitary instance, the speedily suppressed military rising at the accession of Czar Nicholas, in December, 1825. They paint the shocking ignorance, superstition, and corruption prevailing among the one hundred million subjects of the Romanoffs, as excrescences owing their existence to an accidentally developed monster, Czardom; destroy the latter by a few vigorous blows, and there will be a Russian millennium of freedom, fraternal harmony, and enlightenment. That Czardom may possibly be a many-headed hydra, drawing its life-blood from yet unsubdued native barbarism and intellectual and moral sloth, is not deemed

worth examination. Russian conquering aggressiveness is discussed in the same way: the ever-renewed "Russian cloud-storm" arises only from perturbations in the political atmosphere caused by the insatiable greed and restlessness of the Romanoffs; destroy them, and the Russian bear will hug in peace the Polish lamb, the Turkish ox, and the Afghan boar. The Jacobins, too, predicted that a reign of peace would spring from the blood of the Bourbons—just before they were silenced by the cannon of Bonaparte—and Most teaches that all misery and crime would vanish with the State and the police.

Memorials of Merton College. With Biographical Notices of the Wardens and Fellows. By the Hon. George C. Brodrick, Warden of Merton College. Oxford: The Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan. 8vo, pp. 415.

MERTON COLLEGE, although at the present day less spoken of than several of its fellows, is historically the most important of all the colleges of Oxford. Its establishment in 1264 "constituted an entirely new departure in the academical history of the Middle Ages. Not only was it the archetype upon which all the collegiate foundations at Oxford were moulded, but the *regula Mertonensis* was expressly adopted as a model for the oldest college at Cambridge" (p. 12). The colleges of the two great English universities, with their noble architecture, their charming grounds, and their remarkable social and intellectual life, may all be said to have sprung from the creative mind of Walter de Merton. But not only does Merton College stand as the type of the English colleges, and its chapel as one of the most beautiful creations of Gothic architecture, but the student of industrial and economical history finds here also one of his chief sources of information. It was chiefly from the records of this oldest of corporations that Prof. Rogers obtained the materials for his great 'History of Agriculture and Prices.' Mr. Brodrick's history of Merton College forms the fourth volume of the publications of the Oxford Historical Society. The history is in five chapters, treating respectively of the time before the Reformation, the sixteenth century, the reigns of James I. and Charles I., the Commonwealth and restored monarchy, and the period since the Revolution of 1688. Part II. contains biographical notices of the Wardens and Fellows, while five appendices give valuable documents and additional data.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

- Annual Register: A Review of Public Events at Home and Abroad, for the Year 1885.* New Series. London: Rivingtons.
- Arnold, E. *India Revisited.* London: Triibner & Co.
- Barnes, W. E. *The Labor Problem: Plain Questions and Practical Answers.* Harper & Bros.
- Chamberlain, B. H. *A Simplified Grammar of the Japanese Language.* London: Triibner & Co.
- Cruise of the Alabama.* Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 50 cents.
- De Pevrebrune, G. *Les Frères Colombe.* W. R. Jenkins.
- Dewey, T. H. *A Treatise on Contracts for Future Delivery and Commercial Wagers, Including "Options," "Futures," and "Short Sales."* Baker, Voorhis & Co. \$4.
- Dwight, J. *Lawn-Tennis.* Boston: Wright & Ditson.
- Fawcett, E. *Romance and Revery.* Boston: Ticknor & Co. \$1.50.
- Flint, Dr. A. sr. *Medicine of the Future: An Address Prepared for the Annual Meeting of the British Medical Association in 1886.* D. Appleton & Co.
- Forbes, S. R. *Rambles in Naples: An Archaeological and Historical Guide.* T. Nelson & Sons.
- Fothergill, Dr. J. *A Manual of Dietetics.* William Wood & Co.
- Halm, Dr. O. W. *The Guardian Angel.* Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 50 cents.
- Hunter, W. W. *The Indian Empire: Its People, History, and Products.* Second ed. London: Triibner & Co.
- Jones, D. A. *A Treatise on the Construction or Interpretation of Commercial or Trade Contracts.* Baker, Voorhis & Co. \$5.50.
- Justin, [No Name Series.] Boston: Roberts Brothers.
- Lee, V. Baldwin. *Being Dialogues on Views and Aspirations.* Boston: Roberts Brothers. \$2.
- Lillie, Lucy C. *The Story of Music and Musicians for Young Readers.* Harper & Bros.
- Milne, J. *Earthquakes and Other Earth Movements.* D. Appleton & Co.
- Mombert, Dr. J. I. *Great Lives: A Course of History in Biographies.* First Series. Boston: Leach, Shewell & Sanborn.
- Morley, J. *Critical Miscellanies.* Vol. II. Macmillan & Co. \$1.50.
- Murray, D. C. *Cynic Fortune: A Tale of a Man with a Conscience.* Harper's Handy Series. 25 cents.
- Poor's Directory of Railway Officials and Railway Directors. H. V. & H. W. Poor.
- Rolf, W. J. *The Young People's Tennyson.* Boston: Ticknor & Co. 75 cents.
- Sheldon, Prof. Mary D. *Studies in General History.* Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 85 cents.
- Talmage, Rev. T. de W. *New Tabernacle Sermons.* E. B. Treat. \$1.50.
- Tchernushevsky, N. G. *A Vital Question: What is to be Done?* Thomas Y. Crowell. \$1.75.
- Tchernushevsky, N. G. *What's to be Done? A Romance.* Boston: B. R. Tucker. \$1.
- Thackeray, W. M. *Vanity Fair.* 2 vols. \$1.
- The Death of Hewfik Pasha: A Confession. Funk & Wagnalls. 80 cents.
- Tinsau, L. de. *Madame Villeféron jeune.* New York: Christern.
- Tregar, E. *The Arvan Maori.* London: Triibner & Co.
- Tyler, Sarah. *Buried Diamonds.* A Novel. Harper's Franklin Square Library. 20 cents.
- Tucker, Rev. H. W. *The English Church in Other Lands, or the Spiritual Expansion of England.* A. D. F. Randolph. 80 cents.
- Van Dyke, T. S. *Southern California.* Fords, Howard & Hulbert. \$1.50.
- Volzard, E. *Etude sur la langue de Montaigne.* Boston: Schoenhof.
- Wade, W. P. *A Treatise on the Law of Notice as Affecting Civil Rights and Remedies.* 2d ed. Chicago: Callaghan & Co.
- Warden, Florence. *Doris's Fortune.* D. Appleton & Co. 25 cents.
- Wells, H. P. *The American Salmon Fisherman.* Illustrated. Harper & Bros.
- Westcombe, W. H. *The Irish Question and the Issues it Involves: A Letter to the Prime Minister.* Scribner & Welford.
- Wilkinson, H. S. *The Eve of Home Rule: The Impressions of Ireland in 1886.* London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 50 cents.
- Wilson, J. G. *The Centennial History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of New York. 1785-1885.* D. Appleton & Co.
- Winter, J. S. *Pluck: A Novel.* Harper's Handy Series. 25 cents.

"A very original and deeply interesting novel, full of plot, incident, spirited talk, and character, and never too improbable for belief. It deals with that question—decidedly of the earth, earthy—which novelists had much better leave entirely alone unless they can treat it as well as it has been treated here: the old, old problem of confused love and duty, passion and law. The situation has new features, however, and is admirable and noteworthy for the way the problem is solved. . . . The extreme cleverness and the innate nobleness of this conception are hardly appreciated on the first reading, when the reader is absorbed in the interest of the book as a mere story; but the fineness of it, as a study of human nature, makes it really a striking study of the

conflict between good and evil. . . . Such a situation is novel in the world of fiction, and is worth dwelling upon as a bit of subtle psychology. Besides this there is a great deal in the book to hold one's interest. The character drawing is admirable. . . . All are painted with skill and sympathy, and the book as a whole is really a remarkable one."—THE CRITIC ON

"Children of the Earth,"

by Anne Robertson Macfarlane. 16mo, Leisure Hour Series, \$1.

Henry Holt & Co.,

29 West 23d St., New York.

THE TIFFANY GLASS COMPANY

333 & 335 FOURTH AVENUE

NEW YORK

STAINED AND MOSAIC GLASS

LOUIS C. TIFFANY
Pres't and Art Director
JOHN DUFFAIS
Secretary

PRINGLE MITCHELL
Vice-Pres't and Manager
JOHN CHENEY PLATT
Treasurer

TAUCHNITZ COLLECTION

of British authors in half morocco binding, at \$1.25 a volume. Send for catalogue to

DUPRAT & CO.,

Dealers in Rare and Modern Books,
5 East 17th Street, N. Y. City.